

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 112

SP 023 819

AUTHOR Tabachnick, B. Robert; And Others
 TITLE The Development of Teacher Perspectives.
 INSTITUTION Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Madison.
 SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
 PUB DATE Apr 83
 GRANT NIE-G-81-0009
 NOTE 87p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Canada, April 11-15, 1983). For related document, see SP 023 820.
 PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Change; *Beginning Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Institutional Characteristics; Job Satisfaction; Peer Acceptance; *Professional Development; *Role Perception; *Socialization; Student Teacher Relationship; *Student Teachers; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Role; *Teaching Experience; Teaching Styles

ABSTRACT

Two-year longitudinal case studies were conducted of four teachers, beginning with the student teaching experience through the first year of teaching. The study explored ways in which teaching perspectives, evidenced at the end of student teaching, are strengthened or modified during the first year of teaching. It also sought to determine who and what influences the development of teacher perspectives during the first year. Information was gathered through observations and interviews with each subject, colleagues, students, and principal. The study focused on teacher actions and ideas in four specific domains: (1) nature of knowledge, curriculum, and the learning processes; (2) teacher's role; (3) teacher-pupil relationships; and (4) student diversity. A narrative account is presented of each teacher's experiences and the ways in which the teacher adjusted to and complied with accepted practices of the school, or, conversely, adhered to individual perspectives and teaching styles. Appended are definitions for 17 issues or dilemmas of teaching that were used to define teacher perspectives in the study. (JD)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED240112

THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER PERSPECTIVES

B. Robert Tabachnick, Kenneth M. Zeichner,
Kathleen Densmore, and Glenn Hudak

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational
Research Association, Montreal, Canada, April, 1983

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Rossmiller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The research reported in this paper was funded by the Wisconsin Center for Education Research which is supported in part by a grant from the National Institute of Education (Grant No. NIE-G-81-0009). The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the National Institute of Education.

SP023819

The significant people for a school teacher are other teachers, and by comparison with good standing in that fraternity, the good opinion of students is a small thing and of little price. A landmark in one's assimilation into the profession is that moment when he decides that only teachers are important. (Waller, 1932, p. 398)

Colleagues per se and the contextual effects of the workplace are less important to organizational neophytes than are the attitudes of significant evaluators--those having power over the new teacher in terms of their ability to apply organizational sanctions. (Edger & Warren, 1969, p. 389)

The study of classroom effects on teachers raises questions about the extent to which the things teachers do in classrooms and how they think about their work are associated with specific classroom demands rather than with the personal competence and desires of teachers or the quality of their preparation. (Doyle, 1969, p. 51)

Teachers teach as they were taught during their many years as students. Their professional preparation comes late in their own schooling and is too little and too thin to separate them from what their experience has taught them that teaching is. This professional preparation and subsequent practice merely reinforce their own perceptions. Teachers fail to transcend the conventional wisdom of their own profession and continue to teach as they were taught. (Goodlad, 1982, pp. 19-20)

THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER PERSPECTIVES

This paper reports selected findings from a two-year longitudinal study of the development of teacher perspectives. We studied four elementary and middle school teachers during their student teaching experience and first year of teaching. The construct of perspectives which has its theoretical roots in the work of G. H. Mead and his concept of the "act" (Mead, 1938) refers to

A coordinated set of ideas and actions a person uses in dealing with some problematic situation; a person's ordinary way of thinking and feeling about and acting in such a situation. These thoughts and actions are coordinated in the sense that the actions flow reasonably, from the actor's point of view, from the ideas contained in the perspective . . . and are seen by the actor as providing justification for acting as he does. (Becker et al., 1961, p. 34)

According to this definition, perspectives differ from attitudes since they involve actions and not merely dispositions to act. Also, perspectives are defined in relation to specific problematic situations and do not necessarily represent generalized beliefs or ideologies. In an earlier study (Tabachnick et al., 1979-80), we applied the construct of perspectives to student teaching and defined teacher perspectives as the ways in which teachers think about their work (e.g., purposes, goals, conceptions of children, curriculum) and the ways in which they give meaning to these beliefs by their actions in classrooms. Our use of teacher perspectives was similar to that employed by several other researchers (e.g., Janesick, 1978; Sharp & Green, 1975) as we focused on describing the action-idea systems that reflected the experience of student teachers in specific classroom contexts.

In the present study we again utilize the construct of teacher perspectives to describe student teacher and teacher actions and ideas in relation to four specific domains: (1) knowledge and curriculum, (2) the teacher's role, (3) teacher-pupil relationships, and (4) student diversity. Each of these four orienting categories was further defined in terms of several specific "dilemmas" of teaching which had emerged from an analysis of the data from an earlier phase of this study. Appendix A identifies and defines the 17 dilemmas of teaching that were associated with the four orienting categories. These 17 dilemmas gave direction to our data collection efforts during this second phase of our study.¹

In research reported earlier (Tabachnick, Zeichner et al., 1982), we studied the perspectives toward teaching of 13 student teachers who were enrolled in an elementary teacher education program at a large mid-western university and noted any changes which took place in the perspectives of these students during their 15-week student teaching experience. We generally concluded that student teaching did not result in substantial changes in the teaching perspectives that the 13 students brought to the experience at the beginning of the semester. With the exception of three of the 13 students who chose to comply strategically² to the demands made upon them in their work settings, teaching perspectives developed in directions consistent with the latent perspectives brought to the experience but did not fundamentally change over the course of the semester. For the most part students became more articulate in expressing and more skillful in implementing the perspectives which they possessed in less developed forms at the beginning of the semester.³

As a result of the placement procedures that were in use in the program under study, students for the most part were able to select themselves into student teaching situations where there was a strong initial agreement between their own latent perspectives, the teaching perspectives of their cooperating teachers, and the norms existent in their classrooms. Two of the three students who failed to develop in directions consistent with their initial predispositions selected their placements for pragmatic reasons, ignoring any lack of congruency in teaching perspectives; they chose to comply strategically to the demands made upon them without possessing an underlying commitment to the values embedded in their classroom situations. The third student who chose to comply strategically was immobilized by the conflicts that existed between her cooperating teacher and university supervisor and was unable to fulfill her initial expectations for student teaching.

The results of this earlier study generally support the position of Lortie (1975) and others who argue that student teaching plays little part in altering the cumulative effects of anticipatory socialization. On the other hand these results appear to challenge the findings of Hoy and Rees (1977) and others who contend that student teaching exerts a powerful and homogenizing influence on student teachers' perspectives since it is the students' first significant confrontation with the institutional realities of schools. The results of this earlier study support a view of student teacher socialization as a negotiated and interactive process which entails a continual interplay between the intentions of individuals and institutional constraints. The actions of student teachers were not totally determined by the perspectives brought to the experience; nor were they totally determined by institutional

imperatives. Individual intent and institutional constraint both played significant roles in affecting the development of the 13 student teachers although the specific nature of this interaction was different in each case. Despite the fact that only three students strategically complied with the demands posed by their situations and although none of the students significantly redefined the range of acceptable behaviors in their classrooms, the majority of student teachers purposefully selected themselves into situations in which they would be able to act in certain ways, gave some direction to the specific nature of their development, and reacted somewhat uniquely to their situations even in the face of common institutional constraints. There was little evidence in our data that would support the kind of passive response to institutional forces and unthinking acquiescence to institutional demands which has been described frequently in the literature of student teaching (e.g., Gibson, 1976).

We concluded this earlier study with the statement that one is unable to assess the role of student teaching in teacher development by examining the student teaching experience alone. For even if our conclusions regarding the impact of student teaching on the 13 students are correct, there is a great deal of sentiment in the literature regarding the vulnerability of first-year teachers to the press of institutional forces. As will be discussed shortly, there are many who argue that beginning teachers undergo a number of significant changes during their first year of teaching which in many cases are seen to negate the impact of socialization during preservice teacher education. As two of us have argued elsewhere (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981), we take exception to this position and feel that the nature of the

relationship between student teacher perspectives and those held as first-year teachers is not well understood. For although student teaching and the first year of teaching have been the focus of many studies separately (see Zeichner, 1980; Johnston & Ryan, 1983), there have been very few longitudinal studies that have traced the development of student teachers into their first year of employment. In our view it is only through such longitudinal studies that the role of student teaching in teacher development will be understood.

The present study follows four of the original group of 13 student teachers into their first year of teaching and addresses two questions related to the general theme of teacher development. The first question is concerned with exploring the ways in which teaching perspectives evidenced at the end of student teaching are strengthened or modified during the first year of teaching. Despite the existence of many empirical studies which indicate the vulnerability of first-year teachers to the press of institutional forces, studies also exist which demonstrate a great deal of stability between student teaching and the end of the first year. On the one hand it has been shown in studies of both elementary and secondary teachers in several countries that beginning teachers appear to experience statistically significant shifts in several kinds of attitudes during their first year of teaching. For example, beginning teachers have been shown to shift in an authoritarian direction in their attitudes toward pupils as measured by the M.T.A.I. (Day, 1959; Ligana, 1970); to become more custodial in their attitudes toward pupil control (Hoy, 1968; McArthur, 1978); to feel that they possess less knowledge about teaching at the end than at the beginning of their first year (Gaede, 1978); to shift from progressive to more

conventional teaching perspectives (Hanson & Herrington, 1976); to shift in their attitudes toward autonomy in the teacher role toward attitudes held by sanctioning colleagues (Edgar & Warren, 1969); and to rate themselves as less happy and inspiring at the end of the first year than at the beginning (Wright & Tuska, 1968). Lacey (1977, p. 48) summarizes the impression given by much of this research as follows:

The major finding of this research underlines the importance of discontinuity between training and the reality of teaching. The attitudes of beginning teachers undergo dramatic change as they establish themselves in the profession away from the liberal ideas of their student days toward the traditional patterns in many schools.

Despite the fact that much empirical research exists which would support the view that many attitudes evidenced at the end of student teaching are abandoned by the end of the first year, several studies also exist which indicate a great deal of stability between student teaching and the end of the first year. For example, studies conducted by Power (1981) and Petty and Hogben (1980) in Australia and by Mardle and Walker (1980) in England demonstrate that certain attitudes of beginning teachers appear to be resistant to changes (e.g., perceptions of self in the teaching role). Power (1981 p. 213) summarizes the impressions given by these studies when he concludes that his findings call into question the pessimistic statements about "reality shock" for beginning teachers that have been associated with many of the studies cited above.

The present evidence calls into question the pessimistic statements about reality shock for beginning teachers. If the conditions described by Dreeben . . . existed in this study and had the impact they suggested, it is difficult to believe that the influence would not be reflected in teachers' perceptions of themselves in the teaching role, in their evaluation of teaching as an occupational activity, or in their vocational interests and aspirations, even at the group level. But no such evidence appeared in the present data.

It should be noted that in both groups of studies, those that demonstrate changes and those which do not, some teachers experienced significant shifts in attitudes while others did not. Furthermore, among those who changed, the changes were often in different directions. The conclusions of all of these researchers regarding continuity or discontinuity between student teaching and the end of the first year of teaching have been based in each instance on central tendencies or mean shifts in attitudes in the groups of teachers studied. One of the clearest examples of the differential impact of the first year of teaching is provided by a study conducted by Kuhlman and Hoy (1974) in which individual variation is not totally masked by reference to beginning teachers as a homogeneous group. In this study, along with individual variation within the groups of elementary and secondary teachers (e.g., some elementary teachers changed while some did not), there was no change in the bureaucratic orientation of elementary teachers, while secondary teachers as a group became significantly more bureaucratic during their first year. Also, despite his challenge to the notion of "reality shock" for beginning teachers, Power (1981, p. 290) concludes:

The results show the transition from student teacher to teacher to be characterized by remarkable stability It can be seen that, as a group, the sample revealed no significant change in perception of self in the teaching role, aspirational self-perception, professional judgment, evaluation of teaching or vocational aspirations. At the same time . . . while there is group stability, there is considerable systematic individual change There was little or no change for the majority of subjects, but there were some subjects whose scores changed moderately to substantially in one or the other direction.

In the final analysis when attention is focused on the socialization of individual beginning teachers in specific situations, it

seems that both groups of studies cited above support a view of beginning teacher socialization similar to that articulated by Ryan (1970) and Tisher (1982) where the quality and effects of the socialization of beginning teachers are seen as largely context specific and dependent in each instance on the unique interactions of individual and institutional factors. All of the research conducted to date indicates the impossibility of making generalizations regarding stability or change during the first year without an understanding of the characteristics and qualities possessed by specific first-year teachers and knowledge of the specific characteristics existent in the school contexts within which they work. Given the ambiguity and contradiction evident in much of the research cited above and the almost total lack of description of the teachers studied and of the contexts in which they worked, the present study seeks to identify with reference to four teachers the specific conditions (individual and institutional) under which student teacher perspectives are strengthened or modified during the first year of teaching.

The second question is concerned with determining who and what influences the development of teacher perspectives during the first year. While the previous question was concerned with the substance of teacher perspectives as they evolved over time, this aspect of our study explores the nature of the interplay between individual intent and institutional constraint in the development of first-year teachers. Here we are concerned with documenting the ways in which the perspectives of the four teachers were influenced by particular interactions of various psychological and sociological variables that together formed the context of the induction year.

There is clearly a lack of consensus in the literature with regard to the potency and influence of various socializing agents and mechanisms that affect the development of first-year teachers. Studies exist which emphasize the socializing role of more experienced colleagues (Eddy, 1969); Newberry, 1977); pupils (Haller, 1967; Spradbery, 1976); sanctioning colleagues such as principals (Edgar & Warren, 1969); the ecological characteristics of classrooms (Doyle, 1979); and the structural characteristics of schools and the teacher's work (Dreeben, 1970; Dale, 1977; Gitlin, 1983). Evidence also exists that beginning teachers learn how to teach during their first year largely through trial and error in the isolation of their own classrooms (Lortie, 1966) and that they frequently draw upon models of teaching which were internalized during pupilhood (Lortie, 1975) and on their own human tendencies to teach others (Stephens, 1967).

Significantly, for every study that demonstrates the effects of a particular role group or institutional factor in the socialization of beginning teachers, evidence also exists which modifies general conclusions under certain conditions. For example, Edgar and Warren (1969) stress the importance of considering a beginning teacher's internal resources and the degree of affect present in supervisory relationships when attempting to assess the impact of sanctioning colleagues on teacher development. Also, Newberry (1978) suggests several specific conditions that seem to affect the role of more experienced teachers in helping beginning teachers. Finally, Isaacson's (1981) study questions the significance of either principals or experienced teachers in the development of beginning teachers even when structures exist to facilitate such influence.

Lortie (1973, p. 488) states that the socialization of teachers is "undoubtedly a complex process not readily captured by a single one-factor frame of reference." He calls for studies which assess the relative contribution of several agencies or mechanisms under particular conditions. The present study seeks to discover, with reference to the four teachers studied, how particular individual and institutional factors interacted to affect the development of teacher perspectives during the first year and to identify some of the factors (e.g., grade level taught, architecture of the school, and structure of the curriculum) which mediate the relationships between the intentions of individual beginning teachers and various socializing agents and mechanisms. Our intent is to generate a series of "generalizations" related to beginning teacher development which take into account the existence of particular individual factors and institutional conditions.

Methodology

The subjects for this two-year longitudinal study are four teachers (all women) who were enrolled in an elementary student teaching program at a large midwestern university during the spring semester of 1981. In the fall of 1981 all four were employed as first-year teachers, each in a different school district.

Between January and May, 1981, each student teacher was interviewed at least five times and observed while teaching at least three times to enable us to trace the development of teaching perspectives during the student teaching experience. Their cooperating teachers and university supervisors were also interviewed once at the end of the semester to

enable us to identify sources of influence related to the development of teaching perspectives. More detailed information about data collection procedures employed during this period can be found in Tabachnick, Zeichner et al. (1982).

Between August, 1981, and May, 1982, we spent three one-week periods observing and interviewing each of the four teachers during their first year of employment.

Hannah taught an eighth-grade self-contained classroom in a K-8 rural public school which was very diverse with respect to income level. The parents of the children who attended this school ranged from those who were wealthy professionals and farm owners to those who labored on farms. The school had nine classrooms, and Hannah taught all subjects to her eighth graders with the exception of social studies. When her class went to the seventh-grade teacher for instruction in social studies, Hannah taught science to the seventh-grade class.

The second teacher, Rachel, taught a self-contained seventh-grade class in a nine-classroom K-8 Catholic parochial school located in an urban industrial area. This school was fairly homogeneous with regard to the income level of its population and served families in a community with one of the highest unemployment rates in the United States during 1981-82. Rachel was responsible for teaching all subjects in the curriculum except science; she taught social studies both to her own class and to the eighth-grade class across the corridor.

The third teacher, Beth, taught eighth grade as part of a three-member teaching team in an architecturally open-plan public middle school (Grades 6, 7, 8) located in a suburban community. Together the three teachers were responsible for planning instruction and teaching

the approximately 80 eighth graders, one of three eighth-grade teams in the school.

The fourth teacher, Sarah, taught a self-contained fourth-grade class in a K-5 public elementary school located in a well-to-do suburban community. She was responsible for teaching all subjects in the school curriculum.

Both suburban schools were located within ten miles of a midwestern city with a population of 500,000 and served fairly homogeneous populations which ranged from moderately to very affluent. Each of the four classrooms had pupils within it who represented a wide range of intellectual abilities.

A specific research plan was followed during each of the three weeks of data collection in 1981-82. During four days of each week an observer⁴ constructed narrative descriptions of events in each classroom using the six categories of teacher perspectives as an orienting framework. All of the teachers were interviewed several times each day regarding their plans for instruction (i.e., purposes and rationales for particular activities) and their reactions to what had occurred. One day each week an observer constructed a narrative description of classroom events with a focus on six pupils in each classroom who had been selected to represent the range of student diversity that existed for that classroom.

In addition to the daily interviews with each teacher that focused on particular events that had been observed, a minimum of two in-depth interviews were conducted with each teacher during each of the data collection periods. These interviews sought, in part, to explore teachers' views regarding their own professional development through

semi-structured questions that were constructed in relation to the six orienting categories of perspectives or which addressed additional dimensions of perspectives, unique to each teacher, that had emerged during the first year.

Finally, the six "target pupils" in each classroom were interviewed individually once during each data collection period to enable us to determine how classroom life was experienced by individual pupils. These pupil interviews enabled us to confirm or disconfirm our own observations of how students reacted to classroom events and to check the accuracy of teacher statements regarding how time was spent in the classroom during the weeks that we were not present.

Through the classroom observations and teacher and pupil interviews we attempted to monitor the continuing development of teacher perspectives and to construct in-depth portraits of life in each of the four classrooms. Additionally, we sought to investigate the influence of several social context variables on the development of teacher perspectives: (1) school ethos and tradition, (2) teacher culture, (3) student culture, (4) parental expectations, (5) school demographic characteristics, and (6) material constraints on teachers' work such as curricular guidelines. During the two in-depth interviews that were held during each of the data collection periods we asked each of the four teachers about their perceptions of the constraints and encouragements in their schools and about how they learned what was and was not acceptable behavior for teachers in their particular situations. We were particularly interested in the degree to which each teacher felt that she was free to employ initiative and independent judgment in her work and the extent to which each teacher felt she had to conform to the expectations

of others with respect to what to teach, how to teach, and how to organize and manage her classroom.

We also interviewed each principal at least once and interviewed two teachers in each school concerning their views of the six institutional dimensions identified above.⁵ Finally, we collected many kinds of formal documents in each school such as curriculum guides and teacher handbooks.

Tape recorded interviews with teachers, pupils, and principals and classroom observations were transcribed to facilitate content analysis of the data. Several analyses of these data led to the construction of four case studies which describe the development of each teacher and the individual and social influences on their development from the beginning of student teaching to the end of their first year of teaching. The individual case studies were then compared and contrasted to enable us to formulate generalizations related to our more general questions concerning teacher development. Outlines of the four case studies will now be presented, together with our conclusions regarding the two research questions which have been selected for discussion in this paper.

Beth

Beth was a student teacher in a self-contained fifth-grade classroom. Hers was one of four fifth grades in a K-5 school enrolling about 500 children. The community includes a mix of parents who are young professionals, or work at skilled trades and commerce. There are few very affluent families and few qualify for welfare. The school's

tradition is of a lively approach to a fairly traditional curriculum with a few individualistic teachers trying out forms of "open classroom" teaching or creating and teaching content that goes beyond the standard curriculum. Beth commented on the warm, friendly interactions among staff members and their ready acceptance of her as a student teacher.

Beth and her cooperating teacher chose to work together. In separate interviews each comments approvingly about the flexibility and "easygoing" nature of the other and of the classroom. Beth states her preferred teaching style to be one in which by artful questions and stimulating comments the teacher gets pupils to talk and build idea upon idea while the learning "just keeps flowing." In practice, Beth's teaching was more controlled and routine than that. Beth followed the prescribed curriculum and used the textbooks in a routine way, rarely adding to or extending the content in them. She recognized certain students of high ability as able to take part in a "flowing" discussion but rejected this as inappropriate for most students, who needed a more carefully prescribed curriculum. She did interrupt the textbook sequence in math in order to re-teach material she believed her students did not understand. She also planned and taught several short (2-3 day) units in science in which, for example, pupils observed chicks hatching out of eggs or collected and examined snowflakes, but these were exceptions to letting the textbook determine her curriculum.

Relations with pupils were informal though controlled. Beth joked with them playfully ("raise your hand if you're not here"), did not object when pupils call her by her first name (though this made her feel uneasy), commented, "I'd like them to remember me as not their math teacher but that I was a fun kind of teacher." A typical comment to get

pupils quiet was, "We need more silence so everyone can finish," justifying her request in terms of its helpfulness to pupils.

The cooperating teacher played the dominant authority role in the classroom. Beth saw her role to be transmitting the curriculum as determined by those in authority, helping her cooperating teacher carry out his plans to ensure the "basics" were taught, and adding some "trivial" extras (her term).

In the 10-week practicum preceding her student teaching semester, Beth had taught in a class with a high proportion of children from low-income homes. She believed they didn't need to learn the same kinds of things as students in her present school. The former need "something that you have to know to get by with." She believed her present students could benefit more from intellectually complex and abstract ideas. Beth expected pupils who are "behavior problems" to be less intelligent and to achieve at lower levels than conforming pupils. She hoped not to have to teach many "problem" children.

Beth's first year in a regular teaching position was as an eighth-grade teacher in a middle school in a suburban community about ten miles from a city of about 500,000 people. The community has some light industry but most residents worked in or on the edge of the large nearby city. They were much like the parents of the pupils she had known as a student teacher--professionals, well paid skilled trades workers, and self-employed people who were moderately well-to-do.

The school was built to an architecturally open plan and enrolled sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-grade pupils. Groups of three or four teachers were organized into teaching teams to plan for and teach groups of from 80-120 pupils. There were three eighth-grade teams and five

teams of sixth and seventh graders (combined in each team). Forty-four teachers worked with about 700 pupils. On the staff were specialist teachers of arts, reading, a general instructional consultant, teachers of children with "exceptional educational needs," and two guidance counselors. The tradition of the school was one of precisely detailed plans for teaching in a closely controlled environment, monitored by the principal and by tests of the levels of achievement by pupils of Performance Based Objectives (PBO's). The principal is a very strong personality, deeply committed to the curriculum and organizational pattern of the school, and constantly walking through the school to see if standards of quiet, busyness, and neatness are being met.

Two other teachers, both men and both teachers of more than ten years experience, join Beth in making up their eighth-grade team. The three work easily together. They meet for short planning sessions nearly every day, though "planning" consists mainly of decisions about timing and scheduling. Rarely do her colleagues suggest (or does Beth propose) that she give large-group presentations (i.e., to all 80 pupils in her team), even though, by the end of the year, her colleagues hope she would do some of these. Beth's major responsibilities are to teach four ability groups in math and three in reading/language arts and to support the teaching of social studies by working with a group of about 25 pupils. Textbooks and their teacher's manuals generate most if not all the PBO's. Instruction is direct, with teachers deciding the amount of information and the pace of learning for individuals and groups. All groups try to learn the same information or skills and all will be measured against the same PBO's.

Knowledge is taught as though, by public agreement, it is known to be certain. From time to time, Beth acknowledges the private or personal ideas of a pupil but invariably presents a preferred and correct version, legitimate because "it will be on the test." During one observation, Beth says to her group, "The film [we are about to see] covers chapter 4 fairly well . . . You'll need to take notes. I'll stop the tape, tell you what's important, maybe repeat it for you."

It is clear that Beth perceives a number of institutional constraints that shape the choices she makes or that restrict the range of permissible choices. Time is one such constraint. This element is intensified in its effect by two other institutional constraints: the commitment of the staff to Performance Based Education with precise quantities of information to be learned and tested; the organization of the school into teaching teams, where each teacher is responsible in an immediate way to the expectations of two or three colleagues, undertaking specific tasks and the achievement of specific goals, usually expressed as covering specified amounts of information related to a topic. The time constraint becomes an oppressive master and encourages teachers to overlook or ignore subtle differences in student understanding, settling instead for gross responses to individual differences (separate ability grouping permits more or less material to be assigned and more or less time to be allowed for completion of tasks). Time constraints also encourage teachers to accept minimum competencies as the only competencies. There is little incentive to having students dig deeper once they understand the minimum, since it is only the accomplishment of the minimum (PBO's) by which pupil (and teacher) achievement will be judged. Time constraints intensify the

effects of another institutional characteristic, the use of easily available materials and their use in a routine way, i.e., as information-givers rather than in less routine ways, e.g., as data to be examined, challenged, interpreted. (When asked why Annette is the only one who does something different than the teacher-suggested ways of reporting on a book, Beth replies, "It's enough if they do what's there.")

These approaches to knowledge/curriculum are legitimated by the existing teacher culture. Accommodating the other members of the team is an important and high priority. One of Beth's colleagues gets "too interested" in social studies. He is described as "carrying on" (going over the scheduled time), and criticized because taking the pupils off on "tangents" (going into material not tested by the PBO's) prevents his section from being ready to take the teamwide test on the date scheduled.

Personal constraints and personal preferences also help to form Beth's perspective. She feels she knows math and enjoys teaching it. She feels she has little background in social studies and believes that that constrains her from going any deeper or adding much to the information in the textbook or on the worksheets. At the same time she is uncomfortable with the uncertainty inherent in a problem-oriented lesson. Her eyes shone with excitement when some of her brightest math students, almost spontaneously, started inventing alternative solutions to a math problem. But her stated preference, confirmed by her teaching, is for the comfort of knowing in advance of teaching what particular pupil responses you will get during a lesson.

Beth's view of teacher role has changed somewhat from her student teaching perspective. As a student teacher she expected a teacher to invent and develop curriculum even if only as additions to a prescribed curriculum. Her viewpoint now is that "expert others" (administrators, textbook writers, a committee of teachers) will decide what is to be taught; teachers are to manage that curriculum as skillfully as they can. This complements nicely her view of knowledge/curriculum and is supported by her school's curriculum pattern which is designed to make management easy.

Clearly, the teacher's role is sharply separated from the pupil's role. Teachers decide what tasks pupils will undertake, when they are to begin, when they are to stop working or turn to another task. What pupils need is what teachers decide they need, usually the result of a teacher analysis of what pupils lack, e.g., the math skills they fail on a test or information they don't know on a pretest.

Beth talks about nonacademic aspects of teacher role as having importance. Her role as counselor or guide to children is not salient, and almost no time is spent in informal or counseling discussions with pupils on matters not relevant to their academic performance, with the exception of a formal class group that discusses value questions, use of leisure time, and related topics. Interpreting school to parents is mentioned by Beth, but parent contacts seem to be almost entirely confined to reporting progress and such school sponsored events as the class camping experience in which a few parents participated.

The most troublesome part of teacher role for Beth is her membership in a professional group. Early in the year she was distressed to discover that the "big happy family" guided by a benign principal was in

reality a collection of factions who disagreed about most things but tended to agree that the principal was "management" and not one of them. By the end of the year Beth identifies with the teachers as a group but still wants to be guided by the principal and to meet his expectations for her. She feels deprived by the absence of the guidelines provided by continuous feedback to her when she was a student. She doesn't get much feedback from her colleagues and is ambivalent in wanting and yet afraid to get too much from the principal.

In most instances Beth's actions with respect to teacher role conform to and key on the attitudes and actions of her fellow teachers. She maintains a slight distance, e.g., she doesn't interact in a particularly warm or social way with the other teachers, but still seems to want to meet with their acceptance and approval. Beth is very "other-directed" and looks to her colleagues for cues on how to act the teacher role well. What she does as teacher is consistent with her personality and her personal preferences, her vision of herself as teacher. She is slightly ambivalent about routines of teaching. Sometimes she talks as though she should be doing more inventive things, but usually she seems to find the routines comforting. She knows what to do, what to expect if she does or doesn't do some things, how to negotiate for more options or more time with her team members and how to establish student routines that make her bureaucratic responsibilities easier to meet, e.g., keeping order, having busy-looking students, meeting PBO's.

Beth finds it necessary for her own psychological comfort to control pupil behavior. First, she enjoys the sensation of being powerful, of making the pupils mind. Second, she prefers a more formal,

somewhat distant relationship with her pupils. These are both illustrated in an instance she describes. She was annoyed by boys calling her by her first name, joking around, possibly with a mildly sexual connotation. ("Eighth-grade boys had . . . crushes, you could tell.") Beth reports dealing with this directly. ("I sat them down and said that I thought what they were doing was very annoying and I want it to end. And it did.") She comments early in the year that she would "rather have things a little more easygoing, maybe a little more joking around," but the overwhelming preponderance of Beth's comments and teaching behavior suggests just the opposite, that she is comfortable with a distance between students and herself, using controlling behavior to assert her authority and discouraging familiarity and bantering interchange.

Beth falls in with the existing teacher culture in sometimes being sarcastic or belittling students, especially those who are poor achievers, and especially one boy who is a butt of much of the teachers' sarcasm. (Interestingly enough, there is no evidence that this affects the boy's relations with other students, i.e., that they also ridicule him or reject him.) Similarly, she is reinforced by other teacher actions in demonstrating her ability to control students in her charge. There are institutional demands enforced by the principal--that the students be busy, quiet, and, generally, immobile (although the principal seems to be sensitive to the strain that Beth is under as a beginning teacher and tries to get her to relax, smile more, enjoy her work). The distant, formal, controlling, teacher-pupil relationship seems to express the institutional norm. However, Beth is not merely constrained to conform to this. She likes controlling the students,

winning the struggle to control, as it were, and doing so in a direct, public way. This confirms her in her role as teacher and expresses her own personal preferences for order, predictability, and cool teacher-pupil relationships that carefully separate the roles of teacher/friend.

Beth's perspective toward teaching has changed in certain important respects from the end of her student teaching semester to the end of her first year of teaching. Her approach to curriculum is much the same, transmitting mainly the information in textbooks or following the routines set out in teacher's manuals. The one content area, science, in which she introduced several short but lively lessons as a student teacher is an area she didn't teach in her team. The greatest change comes in Beth's relations with pupils. Student teaching was playful; teaching is serious. The student teacher tried to be a "fun" person; as teacher, Beth is a powerful, commanding person who controls behavior and punishes misbehavior. As a student teacher she comments on a teacher's inability to plan the same curriculum, have the same expectations of all children since they are so different from one another; as teacher she refines that belief to mean planning different strategies to get every pupil to meet the same objectives. This is not a matter of inventing or discovering an entirely different perspective on teaching from one held earlier. Rather we see a shift in which elements that were present earlier become salient, while elements which were previously central drift down to very low priorities.

Rachel

Rachel was 22 years old when she began her student teaching experience in January, 1981. During this 15-week semester she taught in one of three fourth/fifth-grade classrooms in a K-5 public elementary school enrolling about 400 children. The school community includes few minorities and has a mix of parents who range from moderately to very affluent. Most of the parents of the children who attend this school are either self-employed professionals (e.g., physicians, lawyers), employed by a nearby state university, or in state government. Rachel attended a Catholic elementary school as a child and completed her two pre-student-teaching practicums in what she describes as highly structured and teacher-directed classrooms in two different parochial schools. When given the opportunity, she deliberately chose to student teach in a less structured and more "easygoing" school where children's interests are incorporated into the curriculum and where she would have opportunities to develop her skills in planning and implementing a more varied and stimulating curriculum. "I didn't want to be in a rigid classroom. I've been in a rigid classroom my whole life."

Most of the teachers in Rachel's school, including her cooperating teacher and one of the other fourth/fifth-grade teachers, had worked together for at least ten years under the leadership of the same principal. This school has a very strong tradition which is described by Rachel's cooperating teacher as one of "active teaching." Teachers in this school play a central role in developing the curriculum, are expected to make learning relevant and meaningful for children and to include pupils in the planning of classroom activities. There is the

expectation for everyone who teaches in this school to plan an integrated curriculum around children's needs and interests and to bring many resources into the classroom other than textbooks, to make the curriculum "more alive and interesting for kids." This emphasis on "active teaching" which encouraged teachers to use independent judgment and creativity in planning the curriculum was evident throughout the entire school. The teachers in the three fourth/fifth-grade classrooms had recently developed their own reading program based on trade books, a creative writing program which had received national recognition, and generally planned classroom activities with a great deal of pupil input. There were very few institutional constraints on teachers' planning of the curriculum.

There was a very strong initial agreement between Rachel's goals for herself as a student teacher and the culture that pervaded her school. She began her student teaching with a desire to develop herself into an open and flexible teacher who is able to make school interesting and enjoyable for kids. "The important thing about school curriculum is that it excites and interests the kids. It's important to have a stimulating class." Rachel came into her student teaching experience with a feeling that schools generally promote pupil passivity. One of her priorities for this semester was to develop her abilities in planning activities that would help students become better able to make informed decisions for themselves and to defend a point of view based on concrete evidence. Many of the activities that Rachel planned during the semester encouraged pupils to view knowledge as problematic, to consider conflicting viewpoints on issues, and to support their positions with reasoned arguments. For example, she structured many lessons

where small groups of children would research topics and make presentations to the class and planned several debates where children were encouraged to express conflicting opinions on current public issues such as violence in America and animal extinction. Rachel's university supervisor commented that Rachel's actions throughout the semester indicated that she was more interested in getting kids to think "in-depth" about issues than with the quantity of material covered.

There were very few external constraints placed upon Rachel by her cooperating teacher in deciding what and how to teach. Rachel's cooperating teacher demanded the same kind of self-direction and inventiveness of Rachel that was demanded of all teachers in the school.

Consequently, Rachel had numerous opportunities to make decisions about what and how children would learn and often made decisions about her teaching based on her assessment of what kids needed and what would interest them. At times Rachel's cooperating teacher would give her broad topical guidelines such as "weather" or "nutrition," and Rachel was free to develop specific objectives and activities as long as they were planned within the framework of "active teaching."

Rachel felt very strongly that children should be given opportunities to make decisions regarding both the content and organization of the curriculum. "Children ought to have input into their learning. They can make decisions about when they will do certain assigned work and what they will do within a certain framework." Throughout the semester, in addition to using her own judgment about what would be relevant and meaningful for kids, Rachel involved the children in deciding such things as what public issues would be debated, which specific topics would be researched and how they would be presented,

which specific books would be read, and in deciding when certain tasks would be completed.

The lessons that Rachel planned and taught during the semester incorporated many human and material resources from outside the classroom and often led the children into the neighborhood to investigate various questions and problems (e.g., identifying birds and trees). When inside the classroom the children rarely worked together as one large group and could most often be observed working individually or in small groups in various parts of the room. The variety of activities and active pupil involvement that were characteristic of Rachel's teaching this semester are exemplified by the observer's puzzlement when seeing two boys flying paper airplanes in a corner of the room and her wondering whether they were "fooling around" or completing some assigned task.

Rachel was very concerned about relating the curriculum to the lives of her pupils and with incorporating the personal knowledge of pupils into her lessons. She viewed knowledge as meaningful to students only when it is tied into their prior experiences. Because Rachel not only wanted to respond to her pupils' interests but to expand them as well, she frequently sought ways to make the curriculum "meaningful" for her pupils when they had no prior experience with what was being studied. For example, when reading a story about a blind girl in one of her reading groups Rachel arranged a trip to the Braille Society and a meeting with a blind pupil in another classroom so that her pupils would have some personal experience that could be related to the story.

The central problem for Rachel as a student teacher was to develop skills and ideas for getting pupils actively involved in interacting

with the curriculum. Her attempts to implement a varied curriculum which encouraged active pupil involvement were reinforced by her pupils' enthusiastic reactions to her teaching. The children, who had experienced a similar pedagogy throughout their elementary school careers, eagerly took advantage of opportunities to voice their opinions and to select content and materials to be studied. Rachel was encouraged by her pupils' reactions and commented, "They're really ambitious to learn. You get a lot of satisfaction when you see their excitement."

However, despite Rachel's success in implementing a varied curriculum which elicited the involvement and enthusiasm of children, her relationships with the children were relatively distant and formal and almost always focused on matters related to academic content. She was rarely observed interacting with children about personal matters not connected to the curriculum. Rachel expressed an ambivalence at the beginning of the semester regarding her desire and ability to exert her authority as a teacher when working with her class as a large group and generally felt more comfortable giving pupils assignments which would be completed individually or in small groups. She did not want to "set herself above the kids," but realized that she needed to exert some authority and to set some limits in order to accomplish her goals. This ambivalence about her authority as a teacher and her inability to establish warm personal relationships with children did not result in serious problems this semester because of the self-directiveness of her pupils, but they would become matters of central importance the following year.

Because of the strong agreement between the latent perspectives that Rachel brought to student teaching, the culture of her school, the perspectives of both her cooperating teacher and university supervisor

and the reactions of her pupils, Rachel was able to develop over the semester in a direction consistent with her initial goals. She and her supervisors felt that she came into the experience with lots of ideas about what should go on in a classroom but without the practical skills needed to make her pedagogy a reality. Rachel learned from her cooperating teacher and supervisor a variety of planning and organizational skills needed to make her lessons "flow." Rachel and her supervisors also felt that she became more comfortable by the end of the semester with exerting her authority as a teacher when leading a large group. Rachel felt very confident at the end of the semester about her abilities to implement "active teaching" and felt that her excitement about her work and her high expectations for pupil involvement would make the "active teaching" model successful with any group of children that she would teach in the future.

Rachel's first year in a regular teaching position was spent as the only seventh-grade teacher in a nine-classroom K-8 Catholic parochial school located in the downtown area of a heavily industrialized city with a population of around 120,000. Rachel taught all subjects except science to her seventh-grade class (including religion) and taught social studies to the eighth-grade class across the corridor while the eighth-grade teacher taught science to the seventh graders. This city was experiencing one of the highest unemployment rates in the United States during 1981-82 and most of the parents of Rachel's children had been employed (before being laid off) at a large automobile factory located a few blocks from the school.

Most of the children in Rachel's class were of Italian heritage. Some had been born overseas and had recently moved to this city so that

their parents could obtain work at the local manufacturing plant. Not all of the children, however, lived in the neighborhood surrounding the school and several parents drove their children to school each day because they wanted them to attend the same school that they had attended as children. The majority of the children were bilingual, fluent in both English and Italian, but several of the parents did not speak any English, which forced Rachel (who did not speak Italian) to communicate with them (e.g., during phone calls) through younger siblings of children in her class who happened to be home at the time.

The culture in this school was very different from that which existed in the school where Rachel student taught. Instead of an emphasis on "active teaching" there was a strong emphasis throughout the school on keeping the pupils quiet and busy. Rachel and all of the other teachers were given textbooks to use as the primary source in each subject area and were generally expected to cover what was in the texts. Teachers were free to supplement the texts as long as they did not stray too far and as long as the material in the texts was eventually covered. The principal, who checked teachers' lesson plans each week, said that she left the teachers pretty much on their own as far as how to teach but that she expected teachers to check with her first before trying something "too different." Teachers were also given daily schedules by the principal which specified when and for how long each subject area was to be taught.

From the beginning Rachel felt a lot of pressure from the principal and the other teachers to keep her pupils quiet and busily working in their seats and worried that she would not be able to assume "the authoritarian teacher role" that was expected of her. "Discipline is

the biggest thing in a Catholic school. They want discipline and they want quiet. That's probably the hardest thing for me." Throughout the semester Rachel interacted with the other teachers regularly on a social basis, but she did not feel that she got much assistance from the other teachers or from the principal in implementing her desired pedagogical approach. "The teachers are very nice, but I get no help. The most advice is that I've got a bad group and that I'll learn from experience." Rachel also felt that she did not get support from the majority of the parents of her pupils whom she felt expected her to do everything on her own.

At the beginning of the year Rachel was told by the sixth-grade teacher who had worked with her class the previous year and by most of the other teachers that her class was "pretty much impossible." "The teacher last year had the same problem with them and she never resolved it. She was just glad to get rid of them." Rachel was advised to structure her class very tightly and to exert a high degree of overt teacher control if she wanted her pupils to comply. Despite the fact that Rachel relied very heavily on the texts in planning her lessons, she largely ignored the advice of her colleagues and principal and from the very beginning tried to recreate her student teaching experience by planning special lessons to supplement or replace the more routine lessons based on the texts. She taught several lessons toward the beginning of the year that required pupils to work independently or in small groups using reference materials to investigate specific questions and problems that had been designed to engage their interest and active involvement. For example, she began her math class for the year with a unit on graphing (which was not in the curriculum) where students were

required to graph facts related to their own lives; planned a unit on poetry where students reacted to such poems as one about a boy who hated school, and wrote their own poems; and planned small-group research projects related to different cultures and climatic zones.

Rachel also continued her attempts to present knowledge to students as problematic even when relying on the texts and asked many open-ended questions that required independent thought and the application of ideas to new situations (e.g., why particular plants and animals are suited to some climatic zones and not others). Despite isolated successes with inquiry-oriented lessons, Rachel's students did not respond enthusiastically to her efforts to make at least some of the curriculum relevant and meaningful, and for the most part they rejected her efforts to involve them actively. Rachel placed part of the blame for her failures on the dominant culture of her school and her pupils' lack of experience with her methods. In December she comments:

These seventh and eighth graders are already into their routine, and they're not used to doing things on their own. I've tried to have them do some kind of reference skills on their own, but they're totally lost. They can't handle it. I did that for two months and I'd help them but it didn't work at all. I figured out that I'm just gonna do it more structured and pass out worksheets and to do it as a large group together. It's really hard for them to do it if they're not used to it. At _____ they were doing it at the fifth grade and picking it up fast. They were probably doing it from the first grade Here, if you're having a bad day, the best thing to do is to read out of the book They will just line up like little soldiers and get their books out and read. That's not the best way to do it, but that's what they are conditioned into doing.

For the most part Rachel was unable throughout the year to get her pupils to respond either to the "active teaching" learned as a student teacher or to the more routine teaching that was characteristic of her new school. All of our observations indicated that Rachel was engaged

in a continual struggle to get her pupils to complete work of any kind or to participate in class discussions. She frequently raised her voice to attempt to enable class discussions to be held; frequently repeated directions and information because of the lack of pupil attention; and frequently threatened, bargained with, and punished children in the hope of establishing a minimum amount of control.

Despite Rachel's attempts to elicit pupil cooperation, her pupils always seemed to get the best of the situation and to undermine her authority overtly and covertly. Rachel frequently became so frustrated with her pupils' lack of cooperation that she often lashed out at the class in anger ("Don't ask me what page we're on. I've told you three times already.") and threatened her class with extra homework, with staying after school, and with more routine work many times each day. "If you don't work on this we'll go back to worksheets." The pupils' resistance to Rachel's efforts was very strong and constant, and their contempt for her activity was often blatant and cruel. For example, during a discussion in the eighth-grade social studies class on Andrew Carnegie, several students openly copy insignias from record album covers, others throw things around the room, and one boy sits back in his chair with his feet up on his desk with a note stuck to his foot, "Do not disturb." At one point toward the end of the year Rachel's frustration became so great that she openly cried in class and a pupil told the observer, "She said she couldn't stand it anymore." Students would pass notes to each other in open defiance of Rachel's directions, regularly fail to complete assignments on time, blatantly cheat on tests by walking around the room looking at others' papers, and often leave the room laughing when they were sent into the hall as punishment for

misbehavior. The majority of her interactions with children were negative in quality, and pupils frequently responded to her requests with sarcasm. After Rachel scolded a girl for drawing during a math discussion, "There is a time and place for everything," the girl replied, "Seven o'clock tonight at Jack's house."

Despite her isolated successes in engaging her pupils on tasks, the struggle between Rachel and her students was so constant and dominant that during one of the rare moments of cooperation the observer comments in surprise, "The students are actually quiet and writing their poems." Because of the lack of pupil cooperation, Rachel was often forced to modify her plans and drop potentially stimulating activities for more routine tasks. For example, after attempting to begin a discussion in a social studies class by asking students to think about the difficulties and necessities needed in coming to the "New World" and after failing to get any response, Rachel comments, "We'll read now. It's the only thing you guys understand."

Throughout the year Rachel was understandably preoccupied with eliciting a minimal amount of pupil cooperation and was thrown so off balance by the strength of her pupils' resistance that she frequently failed to take advantage of those opportunities where pupils did cooperate. She was extremely frustrated about her failure to implement "active teaching" ("They don't care about anything, and I don't know how to make it exciting for them.") and felt that she wasn't sure that she had the resources within her to succeed with the more routine approach to teaching that her pupils were used to.

I guess that I don't feel I have the right to tell them that they have to listen. I feel like they should want to learn and that I shouldn't have to cram it down their throats . . . I feel that I have a lot to offer them, but I guess it's

idealistic of me to think that they're gonna sit back and become knowledgeable and then go out and fight the world. I have to get into a more authoritarian role, but it's very hard to come by for me.

Although her successes continued to be rare throughout the year and her pupils' apathy and resistance continued to the very end, Rachel was able to find some psychological peace by the end of the year by disconnecting her "self" from her work. In April she comments, "I think I've come to the conclusion that this is a job and that is all it's going to be. The most important thing is not to get too wrapped up in it I've come to realize that all places aren't going to be like last year and that all kids aren't going to be that excited about learning."

However, despite Rachel's eventual detachment from her work and her hope that the year would end as soon as possible, she continued under great odds to plan at least some of her lessons within the mode of "active teaching." For example, in April she spent a lot of time planning a unit on the labor process where small groups of students went out into various work places in the community (e.g., hospital, courthouse, local factory) to interview workers about job specialization and work interdependency. Although there was almost no reinforcement for this type of activity from her pupils, their parents, other teachers and the principal, Rachel tenaciously clung to her belief that the willing cooperation of her pupils could be elicited by relevant and meaningful lessons that encouraged active pupil involvement.

Despite the great differences between Rachel's actions as a student teacher and as a teacher, her perspective toward teaching had not really changed by the end of the year. Despite her frequent comments about the need to become more authoritarian in her approach, Rachel was to some extent both unwilling and unable to adopt the more routine pedagogy and

authoritarian teacher role that was characteristic of her school. Although she was largely blocked from realizing her own goals as a teacher because of her pupils' rejection of what she tried to offer them, the most significant aspect of Rachel's first year of teaching was that she kept on trying (although with less enthusiasm at the end) to elicit the willing cooperation of her pupils through the curriculum rather than through the authority of the teacher. Her ambivalence toward exerting her authority as a teacher was present throughout her student teaching and came to play a more significant role in her perspective toward teaching by the end of the first year. Rachel was offered a contract in June for the following school year but did not sign it.

Sarah

As a student teacher, Sarah chose to work in a junior primary classroom. This not only provided the kindergarten placement she wanted, but also provided a full-day program with one group of pupils. Children in the junior primary class had completed the kindergarten year but were judged not ready for first-grade work. Edgeton School had about 500 pupils in three classrooms at each grade level from kindergarten to sixth grade. It was built to an open architectural plan but with removable walls. The teachers chose to have the walls up to make each classroom a separate and more private place. There was only one junior primary classroom and it enrolled 11 children in the semester that Sarah was a student teacher.

There was no established curriculum for the junior primary class as there was for all the other grades. The cooperating teacher was expected to find or invent activities that would help the pupils begin to read and do number work, as well as become more practiced in following classroom routines and less dependent on continual teacher direction and assistance.

This particular cooperating teacher appealed to Sarah because of her consideration for her pupils and because of what Sarah perceived to be the sense of community which marked the attitudes of pupils toward one another. Sarah described herself as someone who does not challenge authority or like to argue. (Her supervisor saw her as a very quiet person who would be unlikely to pursue or defend a position contrary to what those in authority wanted.) Sarah thought that the unspecified curriculum and the open and welcoming attitude of the cooperating teacher would provide space for her to "try things out." This proved to be an accurate perception.

Sarah's general belief was that knowledge was largely problematic, with meanings shaped by the personal experience of the pupils. She encouraged the very young children she taught to think carefully about their observations and often asked them why they thought something had happened. She had learned about the language experience approach in her reading methods course but had never seen it in action. Although it was quite different from anything her cooperating teacher did, she was encouraged to try it. She felt free to select topics for study and taught units on the senses (touch, sight, etc.) which relied mainly on active observations by pupils followed by conclusions from what was observed.

There was a great deal of variety among her pupils that Sarah recognized and for which she planned either quite different tasks or as a result of which she expected somewhat different responses to a whole group discussion or a worksheet given to everyone. She said she was trying to know each child and become sensitive to what might hurt someone, what might stimulate someone to like himself better and want to work harder. Hers was a very light touch on the reins of control. The small class size seemed to make little control necessary, and Sarah was crisply sure of herself, her control and structuring of activities visible but unobtrusive. She concentrated closely on what her pupils said and did, and was easily able to shift direction or re-plan on the spot if she was getting signals suggesting the children did not understand or had exhausted their ability to continue.

Sarah believed the teacher role to be to choose goals, but she expected that these goals need not contradict nor conflict with the expectations of a prescribed curriculum. In addition she expected to be imaginative enough to integrate pupil interests into the teacher selected program, to exercise control without being harsh, uncaring or insensitive to the varied abilities and character of her pupils.

The school where Sarah found her first regular teaching job was in a suburban community only about five miles from Beth's school district, but with children coming from more affluent homes. The school was a low, attractive building designed to look from the outside like a large single-family house set back in a very large yard. Inside, its design accommodates 15 self-contained classrooms at each grade level from kindergarten to fifth grade; there are three fourth-grade classrooms. The school staff had the services of a reading coordinator, a school

psychologist, special teachers for art, music, physical education, and for children with learning difficulties.

The prevailing school philosophy was that children should be stimulated to achieve high academic standards that would lead to success at academic levels beyond the elementary and high school. Teachers at each grade level tended to coordinate their work somewhat with one another, moving at almost the same pace and covering the same topics. There was little opportunity for planning or even carrying on discussions with teachers at other grade levels because teacher time was constantly in use. Even the half hour teachers were required to stay at school after the pupils left, seemed to vanish in meeting the requirement that teachers must stay with bus-riding children until they were safely loaded onto the school bus. There were no scheduled recess times, and teachers tended to provide recesses as these fell conveniently into the schedule, supervising the children's play themselves.

There is a general but mild anxiety among the teachers about meeting the expectations of parents that pupils will achieve well. Pupils are generally highly motivated, even competing with one another in achieving academically. Teachers perceive the parents of these children to be insightful enough to notice when their expectations are not met, powerful enough not to be satisfied by bland assurances. Although the school follows a fairly conventional curriculum in the various subjects, some teachers encourage active investigation by pupils, and most teachers appreciate and share their class' artistic work proudly. This fits into their perception that parents expect the school to go beyond a routinized curriculum.

When asked what behavior he would approve in a first-year teacher, the principal says,

I would say the flexibility of the teacher, being able to change plans in midstream . . . when things aren't working out, to be flexible and try a different approach. I would also expect to see that the first-year teacher would take care of the individual differences in the classroom and not be teaching en masse lessons to the youngsters The teacher would have to have a very positive outlook and be very humane in her treatment with the youngsters . . . not to create a classroom . . . with threats and duress that children would be placed under because the demands of the teacher [were followed] with certain punitive measures.

This flexible, responsive, and humane teaching is to take place within a curriculum framework of topics that are to be the same for all teachers at a grade level. As the principal describes it,

The important thing is that the youngsters are exposed to the same curriculum as the other fourth-grade children in the other classrooms. It would not be permissible for her to bring in an outside unit that did not pertain to the study of Wisconsin, say, that she decided she was going to study about Africa Science would be the same thing. There are certain units that must be taught to the fourth-grade children The strategies that she employs are up to her . . . [also the order in which units are taught] would be her option.

Teachers acknowledge that the formal culture of the school contains these explicit constraints. An informal culture of belief and behavior quietly contravenes many of these rules under such conditions as the following: there is no direct and open challenge to the authority of the formal culture or its spokespeople (particularly the principal); teachers meet most or all of the requirements of the standard curriculum before undertaking any innovations; academic achievement (especially on standardized tests) remains high; parents do not complain; pupils are not unusually noisy or out of the control of the teacher. As part of the informal culture, teachers add content that interests them into the standard curriculum (e.g., a teacher suspends the formal teaching of

reading for three weeks while a class writes and produces a play); they manage activities discouraged by the principal (a teacher has pupils bring hammers from home on the bus for a construction project since, though discouraged, it was not expressly forbidden by the principal); teachers loosen the supposed control of curriculum guides by keeping them in the closet unused while they use the texts and mutual agreement among those teaching at a grade level to preserve a more or less coordinated and coherent curriculum. Thus, while the curriculum topics control what is taught, there is considerable freedom to add topics, to lengthen or compress the time spent on a topic, and to arrange for various approaches to teaching any topic.

The informal culture often supports the formal culture, as in the following incident:

Sarah was told by one of her colleagues that on Fridays she can put the kids on the bus and "just keep walking," as no one expects teachers to stay until 4:00 p.m. on Fridays. A teacher notices her leaving the school and comments, "We're supposed to stay until 4 o'clock." Sarah says confidently, "Oh no, on Fridays you don't have to." In the next faculty meeting the principal comments that teachers are not to leave school before 4 o'clock, including Fridays. A second colleague of Sarah's explains that she often leaves early but always asks for and gets the principal's permission to do so. Sarah uses the bureaucratic structure after this, asks to leave early several times and is never refused.

Sarah's perspective toward teaching was extended and strengthened by the experiences of her first year of teaching, but not substantially changed from the perspective that developed by the end of her student teaching.

Sarah views knowledge as being legitimated by public agreement but believes that knowledge can be refined by testing it against one's personal experience and common sense. She continually invites children to relate concepts and information to their own lives. A very typical

question for her is the one she asked after a boy read from a newspaper article describing flooding on the Red River, "Could you imagine what it would be like to be flooded out of your house?"

Consistent with such a view is Sarah's belief that knowledge is problematic, not certain. Scattered throughout every teaching day are questions and comments that encourage pupils to challenge ideas or to search for another way to understand something or another way to do something. In an interview, one boy describes a situation in which "you have to prove your facts and Jeff and I take up about the majority of science period shouting at each other trying to prove our facts."

Language/reading is organized to be taught to small groups of approximately 10 students, but much of the work is individualized and quite varied. Creative writing and creative dramatics are encouraged, as is frequent use of the school library. Math is highly individualized and typically presents an image of children working in groups, in pairs, or by themselves--some at the chalkboard, some in the hall, others scattered around the room. Two or three children are designated to correct student work or act as helpers. When that fails to help them understand, pupils ask Sarah for help. New concepts are sometimes introduced to the whole group but are more likely to be presented to groups of five or ten children. Science is taught as a whole group activity with texts being used mainly for their illustrations and ideas for experiments. Unlike one of her colleagues who performs experiments while the pupils watch, Sarah has small groups do the experiments themselves, then justify and challenge one another's conclusions.

The typical pattern throughout her curriculum is one in which she, as teacher, decides the over-all approach and its purposes, presents the

topic, but builds in options. In math, pupils choose where, with whom, how quickly, and in what sequence to perform tasks. In other content areas the choices are more restricted but independent decisions are considered by the teacher, often approved and rewarded when they are productive in terms of teacher goals (as when a boy constructs a periscope at home after reading directions for making one in their science text). The more obvious signs of a standardized curriculum (such as ditto masters) are absent partly as a result of control by the principal. In one incident:

Sarah tells pupils who want to put a crossword puzzle on a ditto not to use dittos anymore. Later, Sarah comments to the observer that once she was running something off like this and [the principal] "gave me a funny look." Asked if she thought he disapproved, Sarah answers, "Yes, because [one of the other teachers] told me once she did and [the principal] told her not to."

Yet Sarah's curriculum, if not her teaching, is closely coordinated with that of the other fourth-grade teachers.

Sarah relates to her pupils in a warm, direct style that is very empathic.

Child: Miss _____, can you come see something I did on mine [haunted house]?

Sarah: I sure can. I'd love to, in fact.

On another morning, Sarah is kneeling at the desk of a mentally retarded child mainstreamed into her class.

Emily is feeling unhappy. Sarah is kneeling at Emily's desk, rubbing Emily's back. Emily is crying. A minute of silence [during the sharing of news articles]. Sarah asks, "Anyone else . . . news?" Joanne holds up a poster of cars she drew for fun. Another minute of silence as Sarah talks to Emily. Emily wipes her eyes and gets ready to go to reading.

Sarah is crisply self-assured in directing pupils to address tasks. Pupils seem to require little motivating to get them on task. The work interests them and they respond eagerly to Sarah's encouraging them to

take initiatives, look at an idea from a different vantage point, and make choices. They are easily kept to an acceptable noise level. For her part, Sarah is relaxed with purposeful pupil movement and the hum of activity, as well as with the periodic litter resulting from an active program. Her pupils quickly clean and straighten up the classroom when asked to do so.

Prominent in Sarah's view of a teacher's role is being responsible for what happens in the classroom. Textbooks, curriculum guides, school regulations or the norms of the informal teacher culture must be respected, but they are all open to criticism and can be modified if need be to serve the interests of her pupils as she understands them. Sarah expects to accommodate to institutional constraints but not to be controlled by them. She decides what "rules" she can follow and makes her conformity very visible. She expresses her own values and interests but does this quietly, through subtle insertions into the regular curriculum and rarely if ever in an overt, direct challenge to institutional norms. Within her institution's constraints she has found and created opportunities to be the kind of teacher she wants to be. She turns to the other fourth-grade teachers and to specialists (reading coordinator, school psychologist) for advice about what or how to teach. She picks and chooses from this advice as well as from suggestions from her closest colleagues about how to use the bureaucratic structure of the school for her own purposes. The pace of activities, the burden of varied school responsibilities, and her conscientious efforts to meet the demands of teaching leave her little time to interact with other teachers outside of the fourth-grade group. She seems content to maintain some distance and insure her privacy from the other members of

the staff. While she attends meetings of the school's teacher association unit, she is put off by the disagreements and hostility she perceives there and she never speaks during the meetings.

Although the range of income differences within Sarah's classroom is fairly narrow and represents a fairly affluent group, there is some ethnic variety and a spread of intellectual abilities. Sarah seems to respond to each child as an individual. The variety interests her. She sees it in a positive way as a teaching problem that challenges her imagination and inventiveness and makes the classroom a more interesting place. She seems to enjoy some of her pupils more than others but those reactions seem to be the result of personality compatibilities or clashes rather than the group membership of any of her pupils. She is perceived by her pupils to act in an evenhanded way toward members of the class. She tries to challenge the three or four unusually bright children in her class and regularly gives extra attention and warmth, though not a great deal of teaching time, to the mentally retarded child mainstreamed into her room. Sarah's curriculum is designed to respond differentially to the individual variations among her pupils.

Summarizing briefly, Sarah has extended and maintained the perspective toward teaching which had developed by the end of her student teaching semester. In part, the institutional constraints and elements of the formal and informal cultures of her school were supportive of her preferred perspective. In part, her ability to maintain a low profile while challenging school norms in very subtle ways and her inventiveness in creating accommodations that satisfied institutional demands and her own personal demands at the same time,

made it easy for her to develop more practiced expressions of her perspective toward teaching.

Hannah

Hannah was 24 years old when she began her student teaching experience in January, 1981. During this 20-week period she taught along with four certified teachers in one of two fifth/sixth-grade teams in a suburban middle school (fourth, fifth, and sixth grades only) enrolling about 500 children. There were four teaching teams in this school, each one responsible for the instruction of approximately 120 children.

Hannah had her own homeroom class of around 30 pupils and worked with almost all of the pupils on the team at one time or another, since the instructional program was totally departmentalized. The school community includes few minorities and has a mix of parents ranging from a few who were very poor and on welfare to some who were highly paid professionals. Some of the parents owned or worked on farms, others worked in the village in which the school was located, and the majority commuted to work to a nearby city with a population of around 175,000. The majority of the parents were moderately well off and lived in the village.

Teaching was the second career choice for Hannah since enrolling at the university. She had spent some time studying medical technology, but did not like "sitting on a bench working with machines all day," so she switched her major to elementary education. Since high school Hannah had done a lot of volunteer work with children and she saw teaching as an opportunity for her to combine her strong interest in

science and health related issues with her love for children. Hannah began the semester very confident in her abilities as a teacher and saw the student teaching experience as a chance for her to experiment with a variety of teaching styles, to bring more ideas into the curriculum, and to establish warm and close relationships with children so that they would become excited about learning and feel good about themselves and school. She chose to work in her school because it offered one of the few paid positions in the program, because she was impressed by the modern and attractive physical plant, and because she was given the impression that she would be able to use her judgment in planning the curriculum and that she would be able to use materials beyond those provided to her by the school.

Almost immediately Hannah discovered that her initial impressions of the school were incorrect. "They do a nice job of sugar coating. The first impression is nice but then you live in it and it changes. They do not tell you a lot . . . that got shattered pretty fast." Hannah soon discovered that she was expected to follow the standardized curriculum very closely and to maintain a distance from pupils that made her uncomfortable. She was given lists of specific objectives in each subject area that she was expected to cover and was provided with all of the materials and tests that she was expected to use. All of the children went through the same curriculum at different speeds. Not only was Hannah expected to cover a specific curriculum using prepackaged materials and tests, but she was expected to cover this curriculum within specified periods of time and with a minimal amount of noise and pupil movement. The children switched within the team to different rooms at specified time intervals, and Hannah had very little choice

about when subjects would be taught and for how long. Because of the open architectural design of the school where no walls separated classrooms, all of Hannah's actions were totally visible to the other members of her team. She was told that a minimum amount of pupil noise and movement was necessary with such a design so that classes would not disturb one another.

From the very beginning Hannah openly questioned the departmentalized school structure, the rationalized form of the curriculum, and the distant and formal relations between teachers and pupils that were a part of the taken-for-granted reality of her school. Hannah's cooperating teacher and university supervisor were very aware of her discontent with the school. "She believes the curriculum is too rigid and is always asking why are we doing this" (cooperating teacher). "She thought that her team members were very cold toward the students" (university supervisor). For the first six weeks Hannah tried to run a classroom that violated many of the norms in her school. For example, after her frustration with her pupils' lack of understanding of math concepts, she "dumped" the required math worksheets for two days each week and used Cuisinaire rods to teach math concepts and skills. She also planned a unit using the newspaper in place of the basal reader, attempted to set up learning centers in language arts, and broke down preexisting ability groups by combining children who had previously been classified as high and low achievers. Generally Hannah felt that she was being asked to fit into a teacher mold that she did not like ("They really tried to put a lid on things I wanted to do."), and openly antagonized the teachers on her team by her efforts to go off on her own. "I find that I'm forced into doing things I don't want to do and I

want to break the molds." Despite the pressures on her to maintain a distance from her pupils, Hannah also tried to relate to pupils in areas beyond the academic curriculum and in ways not approved by her school. For example, after catching a few of her pupils smoking pot on the playground, Hannah did not report the incident to her principal and spoke with the children alone after school. She felt that dealing with drugs, sex, and social issues was an important part of her role as a teacher and tried to gain the confidence of her pupils so that they would confide in her.

Hannah was generally not very successful in implementing her "deviant pedagogy" during the first six weeks. The children did not cooperate with her efforts to relate to them in a more personal way and frequently complained that they were "falling behind" when Hannah moved away from the prescribed curriculum. As a result of Hannah's lack of success with her methods, she was continually told by her supervisor and colleagues that she was too idealistic and was asked to consider whether teaching was really for her. "She came in with a lot of fantasy ideas of what teaching was all about and wasn't ready for the real world of teaching" (cooperating teacher). The amount of pupil resistance was not that great but clearly stood out in comparison to the other quiet and smoothly running classrooms on her team.

Feeling all alone and getting constant pressure from her colleagues and pupils to conform to the norm, Hannah made a conscious decision by the end of the sixth week to comply strategically with the accepted way of life in her school. "I didn't want to be put down anymore. There was no support there. I conformed to the situation for the sake of not taking the hassle. I didn't enjoy it, and it wasn't me." From the

seventh week on Hannah stuck more closely to the required curriculum and kept her discontent about school practices to herself. When asked why she no longer voiced her opinions to her colleagues and supervisor, she responded, "Because you want to have your degree and get a recommendation and finish."

Despite her strategic compliance to the expectations of her teachers, Hannah continued on her own to attempt to implement a more varied and lively curriculum and to relate to students in a more personal way. Most often she followed the curriculum and put on the "teacher mask" when in view of her colleagues, but she continued throughout the semester to plan supplementary lessons that altered the students' relations with each other, with the curriculum, and with the teacher. In May the observer comments, "The contrast is great between Hannah's area and the rest of her team where the students are always sitting behind their desks. Hannah rearranges her room, and the kids are allowed to be all over the place working at different things." At the end of the semester Hannah's cooperating teacher and the supervisor were both aware that her compromises after the sixth week represented only strategic compliance and not a change in her perspectives. "I don't think she believed half of the things I was telling her" (cooperating teacher). "I think that although she had to compromise at times she has not changed deep down in the way she will approach teaching in the future." Because of the great discrepancy between the latent (but not fully developed) perspectives that Hannah brought to the experience and the culture of her school, she was not able to develop as a student teacher into the kind of teacher she hoped to be. She felt that she was on her own throughout the semester and felt there was no one in her

school to whom she could turn as a model or who could teach the skills she wanted to learn. "I learned a lot of things of what not to do." Despite the lack of support, Hannah was not able to separate her "self" from her role as teacher and at the end of the semester she still clung to her view that warm and close relationships between pupils and teachers, getting kids excited about learning and feeling good about themselves were the keys to learning. Hannah strongly believed, despite the lack of confirmation from this semester, that the "academics will come easily" after a teacher is able to open up the communication lines between herself and her pupils and establish a relationship of trust. Hannah also continued to express her views in relatively general terms about the importance of integrating pupils' personal knowledge into the curriculum and of making learning fun. Because Hannah was not able to get the guidance that she desired, she was not able to develop (as did Rachel) the skills and strategies necessary for realizing her goals. She reacted strongly against becoming the kind of teacher she saw around her but did not develop well articulated perspectives consistent with her own vision of teaching. At the end of the semester Hannah was convinced more than ever that she wanted to be a teacher and was eagerly looking forward to teaching in a classroom with four walls and toward working with one group of children. Her primary goal for her first year of teaching was to "be able to know my kids really well."

Hannah's first year in a regular teaching position was spent as the only eighth-grade teacher in a nine-classroom K-8 public school enrolling about 190 pupils. This school is located in a rural farm community a few miles outside of a city with a population of 9,000. Hannah taught all subjects except civics to her eighth-grade class and taught science

to the seventh graders while her class went next door to the seventh-grade teachers for instruction in civics. The parents of the children in her class were very diverse socioeconomically, ranging from those who were farm owners and professionals to those who were farm workers. For the most part Hannah's class had been together as a group since kindergarten and would be attending the junior high school in the nearby small city the following year. All of the teachers lived in the immediate area with the exception of Hannah and one other teacher who commuted from a city 45 minutes away. Hannah was also the youngest teacher in the school and the only one who had not completed a teacher preparation program at one of the relatively small state colleges which are now part of the state university system. Finally, Hannah was the fifth new teacher that had come to work in this school in the last three years. Three of these teachers were no longer teaching in this school because of alleged problems with pupil control and with staff, and the fourth teacher has requested a transfer to another school.

The culture and tradition of this school is very complex. On the one hand there is a very strong individualistic tradition in the school that sanctions a teacher's right to do things in his or her own way and there is very little cooperation or coordination among the staff. All of the classrooms except for the seventh and eighth grades are totally self-contained, and each teacher is responsible for all of the instruction for a group of around 25 students. Most of the teachers had been teaching in the school for many years and several had begun their careers in rural one-room school houses where the teacher had total control over the management of the classroom and curriculum. The principal of the school is also a full-time classroom teacher and does

not observe or confer with teachers except for weekly staff meetings which are held after school and occasional individual conferences with teachers.

Consistent with the individualistic tradition of this school there were relatively few overt controls exerted on teachers with respect to the planning and teaching of the curriculum. Teachers were usually given curriculum guides and textbooks for each subject area and were expected to cover the content specified in the guides in whatever order, at whatever pace, and with whatever methods they thought were most appropriate. "Their approach to teaching would be pretty much up to how they feel they can teach the particular subjects in the best way As long as she's [Hannah] following good ethical procedure I would say the rest is up to her " (principal). Teachers were also free to supplement the texts with any other materials and to go beyond what is listed in the curriculum guides as long as the curriculum was covered by the end of the year. During this particular year the curriculum guides were being revised in the district's central office, and Hannah did not receive a copy until April. She was told by the principal to follow the textbooks to ensure that she was covering the required content, but little or no effort was made to see that she did follow them. The most significant controls that were placed on teachers' handling of the curriculum were in the areas of grading and testing. All teachers were expected to give each child 30 "marks" during each subject per report card period and to grade students according to a standard grading scale (e.g., 92+ = A). There was also a great deal of emphasis placed upon pupil performance on the national standardized tests given each spring. The principal, who was willing to tolerate a variety of instructional

approaches from his teachers, told Hannah and the seventh-grade teacher (whose approaches were clearly different from the rest), "We'll see how your techniques work when the kids are tested." Despite the relatively low controls on how the teachers taught the curriculum, all of the teachers with the exception of Hannah and her colleague in the seventh grade stuck fairly closely to the texts.

Alongside the tradition of individualism in this school, there was also a very strong and mostly unspoken agreement among all but the seventh- and eighth-grade teachers about the way in which teachers should relate to their pupils. This approach was characterized by one teacher who had taught in this school for its entire 20-year history as "the old school method . . . you can't have someone here who is too soft with the kids." Hannah became aware of this consensus on teacher-pupil relationships ("In this school it's the teacher's role to be the disciplinarian") through her observations of how other teachers acted, through her pupils' comments, and indirectly through the "grape vine" of her school. Other teachers would rarely confront Hannah directly with criticisms of her more informal style of relating to pupils beyond telling her that she was inexperienced and would eventually learn that "certain methods just won't work." On several occasions, however, teachers complained to the principal, who in turn passed the word to Hannah, that she had violated the preferred formality and distance between pupils and teachers. Hannah was criticized for such things as trusting kids too much, hugging them too much, and for playing her stereo too loud and too often. All of the other classrooms with the exception of the seventh and eighth grades were kept under tight control by the teachers (e.g., kids sitting in rows and quiet). Despite the

relative autonomy which existed for teachers at school, there was a strong informal agreement among staff which initially made Hannah feel isolated and alone.

You begin to try new things; everything is not out of the textbooks or worksheet oriented. They look down on that. But they don't constrain you and say you can't do things. They would never say you can't do something. They'll do it in a roundabout way . . . when it comes back to you, you feel that everyone else is against you.

The community was characterized by Hannah and the two teachers interviewed as extremely conservative and suspicious of new ideas. According to the seventh-grade teacher, "They want a strong emphasis on the three R's and see the rest of the curriculum as extra." A teacher who had taught in this school for its entire 20-year history felt that most of the parents approved of the "old school" methods and expected teachers to maintain tight control over pupils. She stated that many of the parents know what to expect from the teachers because they had attended this school as children. Hannah initially felt more pressure from the parents than from her colleagues to conform to the unspoken tradition regarding the teacher's role and was initially reluctant to act on her instincts because she felt she was perceived as an outsider.

At the beginning of the year, despite the lack of close supervision, Hannah relied heavily on the textbooks in planning the curriculum; however, she also made efforts from the very first day to establish warm and close relationships with her pupils in violation of the school tradition. Hannah continued to describe her basic orientation to teaching as "humanistic" and tried to emphasize the affective and interpersonal dimensions of her work. She felt strongly that a positive self-concept is the key to learning and wanted to find ways to make school enjoyable for both herself and her pupils. Hannah went out of

her way to present herself to her pupils as a "human being" by openly admitting her mistakes and ignorance with regard to curricular content and by freely sharing aspects of her personal life with her pupils. She also made many efforts to get to know each child in her class very closely and to gain her pupils' trust and confidence. For example, early in the year Hannah began the practice of having pupils keep journals which she responded to on a regular basis, took pupils on several weekend field trips, and arranged weekend pajama parties with the girls in her class.

As a result of these and other efforts, Hannah was able to gain access to information regarding many aspects of her pupils' personal lives such as their feelings about their parents and about dating habits. Initially her pupils were very suspicious of Hannah's efforts to break down the conventional barriers between teacher and students and there was a lack of support from her colleagues. Hannah became confused and uncertain in the fall about the direction she should take, and she established several classroom practices and rules which violated her own vision of "humanistic teaching." For example, student grades in math and spelling were read aloud each day, and several arbitrary rules were put in place to monitor pupil behavior (e.g., zeros were given for talking during the reading of grades). Despite these isolated instances where Hannah flirted with more conventional methods of controlling her pupils, for the most part she exerted little direct control over pupil behaviors as pupils gradually began to respond to her efforts, and by November there appeared to be little difference in the pupils' behavior whether Hannah was in or out of the room. The pupils generally stayed

on task with little direction and there were very few instances where Hannah was observed disciplining pupils for misbehavior.

Despite her efforts to establish warm and personal relationships with her pupils which were gradually becoming more and more successful, Hannah was frustrated with her heavy reliance on the textbooks in the curriculum and with her failure to establish a more varied and lively instructional program. While she was very sure of herself in dealing with children in interpersonal matters (e.g., she spoke with children about how to make friends and about dating), she felt that she did not have a clear idea of how to implement her preference for a more integrated curriculum which incorporated children's personal experiences, which gave pupils concrete experiences to relate to ideas, and which elicited their enthusiasm and excitement about solving problems in relation to the world around them. "I just feel like I'm spoon feeding them and opening their heads and pushing the knowledge in."

Knowing that her pupils had been taught "right out of the textbooks" in the past and that they would be taught so in the future, and not confident that she was able to explain to others how particular methods were meeting specific academic goals, Hannah worried a lot about handicapping her students and about not giving them what they were "supposed to learn." She stated that not only were her ideals new to the school, but that they were also new to her. By December Hannah had given up any hopes of meeting her curricular goals and was so frustrated that she considered quitting teaching and accepting another job. After she informed her pupils of a job offer she had received in another state, the pupils got together and tried to convince her to stay and presented her with a certificate praising her fine work. Hannah decided

to stay in her present job largely due to the reactions of her pupils and continued to search for ways to realize her curricular goals.

Another reason why Hannah decided to stay in her job was because of the reactions of the parents of her children. From the beginning of the year Hannah made many efforts to win the trust and confidence of the parents and to learn more about the ways and mores of the community. For example, she visited farms and learned how to milk cows, went bowling regularly with parents, and saw them on a social basis. After an initial distrust of this "outsider" who was attempting to relate to pupils in a way very different than the other teachers, Hannah felt that the parents began to support her ("they were 110 percent helpful") when they noticed that their kids were more involved and enthusiastic about school, were asking different types of questions, and were experimenting more in relation to the world around them. Hannah's ability to mobilize parental support was a significant factor in her ability to violate the school culture and to gradually succeed in running a classroom more consistent with her ideals.

As the year progressed, Hannah became more and more satisfied with her approach to the curriculum. She continued to rely mainly on the texts in planning her lessons (particularly in math), but she gradually made more and more independent decisions that resulted in a greater emphasis on providing concrete experiences for children and on incorporating their personal lives into the curriculum. For example, in the spring Hannah took her class to the state capitol (four hours away) in connection with a unit on state government, initiated a drive to collect one million bottle caps to help kids understand the concept of a million, and had her pupils do aerobic exercises in connection with the

study of respiration rate. To some extent Hannah had been doing these kinds of things all along (e.g., setting up a frog hospital for an entire day in December where the kids dissected animals), but the degree to which she moved away from the texts increased over the course of the year. By April Hannah felt confident enough to drop the basal readers and have her pupils read novels, and to let two pupils teach a unit on engines to the class which drew on their experiences in repairing farm vehicles. Throughout the year Hannah continued to expose all kids to the same curricular content and to stay fairly close to the text in some subjects (e.g., math), but her work in language, reading, and science reflected more and more of the active pupil involvement and problematic approach to knowledge that she had hoped to create since the beginning of her student teaching. By the end of the year Hannah felt that she had come close to her ideal where pupils are thinking critically and constantly and where they are always asking questions and trying to apply their in-class learnings to everyday life.

One of the significant reasons why Hannah was able to move from a point in December where she considered quitting, to a feeling of satisfied accomplishment at the end of the year was the support she received from the seventh-grade teacher. Although this teacher did not model the kind of pedagogy that Hannah hoped to create, he was generally sympathetic to her ideals and supported her efforts to relate to and teach pupils in her preferred way. Hannah and the seventh-grade teacher were able essentially to create a school within a school where they teamed for science and civics instruction (the first teaming in the school's 20-year history), started a student council and school paper, and coached volley ball and track together. The seventh- and

eighth-grade classes frequently did things together that did not include the rest of the school (e.g., play softball games), and the two teachers together were able to withstand the evident displeasure of their colleagues. Our interviews with the eighth-grade pupils without exception confirmed that life in these two classrooms was very different from that in grades 1 to 6. By the end of the year Hannah's pupils unanimously expressed their appreciation for the year that Hannah was able to provide for them. Several of the girls looked to Hannah as a "big sister" rather than as a teacher.

Because of this support from the pupils, parents, and the seventh-grade teacher, and because of Hannah's own skills in dealing with people and her sensitivity to the political nature of schools, she was able to significantly redefine many aspects of school in relation to her own class. She openly questioned many school rules and regulations, such as the rule which required students to sit in assigned seats in the lunchroom, and openly took "effort" into account in the grading of her pupils in violation of school district practice. Significantly, Hannah's class scored the highest of all of the eighth grades in the district on the standardized tests given in the spring. Hannah felt she was able to demonstrate that you can relate to pupils in a humane way and still accomplish academic goals. She was disappointed, however, that she was unable to influence the practices of the other teachers and create a more humane environment throughout the school.

At the end of the year Hannah was looking forward to being rehired the following school year despite receiving a lay-off notice which was justified in terms of declining enrollments. The parents of her children were so satisfied and enthused about the job that Hannah had

done this year that they petitioned the school board to rehire her despite the added costs. Despite being rehired for the 1982-83 school year, Hannah saw herself eventually getting certification as a school guidance counselor so she could work exclusively in the interpersonal domain. Although she felt she had succeeded during this year, she felt that in the long run that there were too many obstacles in the way for her to feel satisfied with a career in teaching.

Development of Perspectives

For three of the four teachers--Beth, Rachel, Sarah--perspectives toward teaching seemed to come into focus by the end of the student teaching semester. Each had a perspective in which a teacher was to exercise considerable control over the style and content of instruction in order to offer pupils an experience of active learning, in which they tested and used their own experience to give deeper meanings to concepts. Beth was the most tentative of the three in holding to such a perspective, but she joined the others in expecting a teacher to interact in a warm and humane way with students. Rachel seemed to have the most difficulty in being close to children, though she stated her belief in the value of this kind of teacher-pupil relationship. Beth differed from the others in being less accepting of pupils as individuals, expecting groups of children to exhibit actions characteristic of some group to which they belonged (e.g., coming from low income homes).

Hannah's perspective toward teaching was more problematic at the end of her student teaching semester. She stated beliefs that would

suggest similar perspectives toward teaching to those of Rachel and Sarah. These statements were definite and unequivocal. The powerful institutional constraints of her school during student teaching and her response of strategic compliance made it unclear whether she would do what she said she wanted to once she was "teacher" rather than "student teacher."

Although there was individual variation, the four teachers were relatively alike in their apparent perspectives toward teaching when they took up their first teaching positions. They went into quite different school settings, but the four schools were alike in certain general ways. Within each school there was a collection of related institutional elements that projected a formal school culture. These included: explicit school regulations (e.g., teachers must stay at school until 4:00 p.m.; pupils are not to be in classrooms unless supervised by a teacher); official time tables (e.g., a specific time when pupils change classes for reading; time when last school bus leaves); curriculum guides and curriculum materials (Performance Based Objectives, textbooks, elaborately complete worksheets or a ban on using worksheets); formal status relations of principal, specialist teachers, teachers, and pupils.

At the same time, each school was characterized by an informal school culture, one that was often tacit rather than explicit. Even when explicit, the informal culture was less visible than the formal culture, being expressed in private conversations between teachers, casual remarks not intended for wide distribution, interpretations of the publicly acknowledged formal culture expressed in teacher, principal, pupil actions. There was usually one formal school culture,

but there were several different and often conflicting versions of the informal school culture within a single school.

Three of the four teachers--Sarah, Rachel, and Hannah--maintained the perspectives toward teaching which they brought with them to their first year of teaching. Sarah and Hannah used the experience of the first year to strengthen and refine their perspectives. Rachel's was maintained even though she had few instances of successful teaching to sustain her.

For Sarah, extending her perspective was not a struggle. Both the formal and informal school cultures encouraged her to continue to express her perspective, although in a restrained and cautious form. The most constraining element of the formal culture in her school was the control exerted by daily time schedules, the rush to "cover" all the material scheduled for the year, the requirement that she stay with her pupils as long as they were in school. The curriculum itself demanded attention to predetermined topics, but left considerable opportunity for Sarah to breeze by some and dig deeply into other topics. The informal school culture acted as a countervailing force to the formal culture in her school. Her colleagues in the other fourth-grade classrooms used the freedom they had to express unique teaching styles, to introduce interesting and varied activities in order to keep pupil interest and effort high. Other teachers in the school casually praised Sarah's evident success (as guessed from student essays and murals displayed in the hall) in eliciting thoughtful and creative products from her pupils. Despite being worn out at the end of the day, Sarah picked up the underlying enjoyment of teaching and of being able to circumvent

unwanted constraints, that was part of the informal culture of her school.

Rachel and Hannah encountered considerable pressure to change to a perspective that was impersonal, permitting pupils almost no deviation from teacher-set requirements and encouraging little pupil initiative or creativity in building concepts or in analyzing generalizations about the social or natural world.

Rachel was alone in her school in challenging this perspective. There was some constraint imposed by the formal school culture as the principal monitored the noise and movement levels in her classroom (the standard was to have little on either). Neither the curriculum nor other formal school regulations were very constraining. Unfortunately, Rachel was unable to keep her pupils quiet or focused for very long at a ~~time~~^{time}. She found her efforts to encourage pupil initiative rejected or abused by students who had been socialized to expect teacher demands and close control in a social context in which adults and children were "natural" enemies. This was part of the ethos of the informal teacher culture as well. From her colleagues Rachel had the scant consolation that previous teachers too had found her class difficult to manage. Rachel did not have the skill to overcome the pupils' long period of induction into patterns of response other than the self-motivated learning she hoped to encourage. Her doubts about asserting her authority and her inclination to avoid too close relationships with her pupils made it difficult for her to get their attention. Her interest in mobilizing parent support and cooperation was thwarted by lack of knowledge of the cultural content of her pupils' homes and her inability to talk to people who did not feel confident speaking English. Her fear

of her principal's disapproval led her to early attempts to act the authoritarian teacher that she believed her principal wanted her to be. Her inability to get her pupils to behave when she tried to be strict and demanding helped her to reaffirm her earlier perspective. Despite her lack of support from colleagues, the rejecting and often disruptive responses of her pupils, and her own feelings of despair, Rachel was sustained by a few successes and continued to act as she thought a teacher should, trying again and again to justify her faith that if she could make the work interesting enough, involve students in active learning, they would be intrinsically motivated to learn and even become better behaved.

The pressure for Hannah to change her perspective was more subtle but no less pervasive. There was almost no direct supervision of her work by her principal since he was responsible for teaching one of the grades on a regular, full-time basis. Minimal control came through other elements of the formal culture; curriculum guides, for example, were not even available to her until near the end of the school year. The pressure was largely of an informal kind. Teachers shook their heads in disapproval of her warm and close personal interaction with her pupils. They warned "it won't work" to trust eighth graders to monitor their own behavior, make decisions about where and with whom to work in the classroom, to let pupils see the teacher as a person as well as a professional or, conversely, to try to learn too much about the nonschool lives of children and their families. Hannah chose to try to know the community and her pupils' parents in order to understand her pupils better, in order to help her convince parents that her "different" school program was justifiable. At the same time, she chose

to exploit the openings in the weakly formed net of teaching constraints in order to develop and implement a more varied program that relied more on pupil participation and pupil judgment than was typical of the school. Although her pupils, like Rachel's, had had seven years of training in a different system of curriculum and of teacher-pupil relations, Hannah's social and political skill, the pupils' traditions of mutual peer support, and their warm acceptance of Hannah as "teacher-friend" overcame any pupil resistance to learning new ways to be pupils in school. In addition, there were obvious rewards to pupils in having the school day become more enjoyable, less ego-destructive, more productive of interesting things to do.

In contrast to the other three teachers in our study, Beth appeared to shift away from her earlier perspective during her first year of teaching toward one that was more bureaucratic in terms of teacher role and more impersonal and controlling in terms of teacher-pupil relationships. This was consistent with a schoolwide emphasis upon teaching knowledge as certain, through a curriculum organized to stress the transmission of information and routine skills of language and math rather than the examination of issues or the exploration of ambiguities. Such a curriculum helped control pupil behavior by narrowing the range of acceptable pupil response. It can support a view of student diversity in which all pupils are expected to achieve the same results although very likely at different rates. Beth had little patience with pupil behavior or ideas that challenged or were different from the official view.

This shift in perspective was encouraged by the direct control by the principal, who wandered through the school looking and listening for

signs of conformity to the officially approved curriculum patterns and maintenance of quiet, busy looking students. He was reinforced by the bureaucratic organization of school into teaching teams. Although there was no intermediate level of administration (e.g., teachers who were "team leaders"), the teachers monitored one another since deviation from the agreed-upon schedule or distribution of pupils affected the other members in the team. Supervision of teacher behavior was facilitated by the open architectural plan of the school which made large areas of the school visible from any one vantage point. The "leakage" of sound and the potentially disturbing effects this could have on other pupils and teachers was a strong incentive to enforcing strict compliance to rules of quiet work in order to avoid annoying one's colleagues. The curriculum pattern itself, and the close interdependent timing of pupil tasks, extended another form of control, constraining teachers to move on to the next task whenever minimal achievement goals had been met and discouraging teacher or pupil initiatives that took "too long" (longer than planned) or aimed toward side roads of knowledge not part of the preplanned (and post tested) curriculum.

Who and What Influences the development of Perspectives

All institutions, and schools are no exception, employ mechanisms of control to exact greater productivity from workers and to try to ensure that organizational members follow accepted procedures within an organization. Richard Edwards (1979) identifies three different forms of organizational control in his analysis of the struggles of management and labor to exert control within the workplace.

First, with personal or direct control, superordinates (which in the case of the school would be the principal) personally supervise the activities of workers and through close monitoring of workers' actions ensure that workers comply with organizational norms. Secondly, with bureaucratic control, control is embedded into the social structure of the workplace and is enforced through impersonal bureaucratic rules and hierarchical social relations. Sanctions and rewards under bureaucratic control are dictated by officially approved policies to which workers, in particular role groups, are held responsible. Finally, with technical control, an organization's control over its members (direction of work tasks, evaluation of work done, and rewarding and disciplining of workers) is embedded into the physical structure of the labor process, and jobs are designed in such a way as to minimize the need for personal supervision by administrators and to minimize the need to rely on workers' compliance with impersonal bureaucratic rules.

This framework for examining various forms of organizational control was very helpful to us for understanding how the first-year teachers learned what was expected of them, how desired behaviors were reinforced, and how organizational sanctions were applied. Generally, we found that there was very little direct and close supervision of the first-year teachers by their principals. Although all of the principals had very clear expectations for what the teachers were supposed to teach and for how they should manage their classrooms, there was very little effort on the part of principals (with the exception of Beth's principal) to attempt personally to ensure teachers' compliance.

On the other hand, as one would expect, there were numerous bureaucratic rules in each case which attempted to dictate to the

teachers how and what to teach, procedures for managing pupil behavior in and out of the classroom, and the general activities of teachers and pupils (e.g., rules for when teachers could leave at the end of the day).

We found that bureaucratic rules and regulations (e.g., in curriculum guides, teacher handbooks) gave the beginning teachers varying degrees of information about what was expected of them and of the limits beyond which organizational sanctions would be applied. We also found, consistent with Weick's (1976) notion of schools as "loosely coupled systems, that the first-year teachers were frequently able to ignore or even to openly violate bureaucratic rules when they wished to do so. For example, despite a policy in her school that required teachers to grade pupils according to a standardized grading scale, Hannah raised the scores of her pupils when she thought they had put their best effort into their work. Sarah violated school rules and procedures more subtly; so subtly, in fact, that it would be very hard to know what she was doing unless one spent an extended period of time in her classroom. Only Beth willingly complied with school rules and regulations on a regular basis and adopted a "bureaucratic perspective" toward her work. Despite the fact that bureaucratic control was able to penetrate the classrooms of the four teachers, in three of the four cases teachers were able to employ independent judgment and personal discretion which had the effect of minimizing the impact of bureaucratic rules.

One of the most interesting aspects of our findings is the significance that technical control played in all the schools, but particularly in Beth's experience. Technical control was embedded into

the form of the school curriculum and had a great deal to do with explaining how Beth learned what was expected of her (e.g., how and what to teach), and with understanding how her work was monitored and evaluated. In her school, curricular objectives, content, materials, and tests were largely predetermined before she came into the setting. The expectations for Beth were relatively certain in comparison with the other teachers we studied. Her activities were heavily influenced by the performance based curriculum which she was expected to follow closely. The form of control in this situation was very different from the three other situations, where teachers were given broad curricular goals, access to a variety of materials and where there were more opportunities for teachers to exercise independent judgment and initiative in their work. In these other situations, there was less certainty with regard to institutional expectations, although the teachers reacted to this uncertainty in different ways.

Apple (1983), Gitlin (1983), and Wise (1979) have recently argued, and have provided some empirical support for, the view that technical control is a significant aspect of the way in which teachers are socialized into their work and of how institutional norms are maintained over time. Our research confirms their more general position that schools exert varying types of organizational controls over ^{teachers'} ~~teachers'~~ work and that it is important to consider how different forms of organizational control contribute to communicating institutional expectations to teachers, and provide various mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating teachers' activities.

There are some general statements that our data suggest and that may be applicable to other contexts than the ones we studied.

(1) As studies by Carew and Lightfoot (1979) and Metz (1978) have suggested, it is at least sometimes the case that various and often conflicting teacher subcultures and teaching styles exist within a single school. The view expressed by Hoy (1968), that there is a single and homogeneous teacher culture into which neophytes are socialized, is not always correct. We found that this view of a consensus school culture was not descriptive of three of our four schools. We had to attempt to identify the various teacher subcultures within a school, as well as formal and informal school cultures, and the often conflicting attempts to influence beginners on the part of experienced colleagues.

(2) It cannot always be assumed when looking for the socializing influence of experienced colleagues that there is an initial discrepancy between beginners and veterans in terms of teaching perspectives as has often been assumed. The "loss of idealism" (or "curve of disenchantment") that is frequently referred to in the literature was not a significant factor in two of our four cases (i.e., Beth and Sarah). In one case, there was a very strong initial agreement between the beginner and her colleagues, and there was not a loss of idealism because the idealism was never there to begin with. In the other case, there was initially a strong overlap between the perspectives of particular experienced teachers and the beginner which the first-year teacher later transcended in subtle ways.

(3) Direct and personal control, exerted by the principal, was not a powerful factor in three of the four schools. Principals articulated general guidelines to practice and for curriculum but did not monitor compliance. None of the teachers looked to the principals for assistance. Similarly, the self-contained organization of three of the

schools minimized the controlling effects of a bureaucratic organization. In Beth's school, there was considerable pressure on all teachers to conform to a perspective preferred by the administration and the majority of teachers. This pressure took the form of the principal's more frequent supervision, though it was often casual and indirect; the bureaucratic organization into teaching teams, each team of teachers planning for and teaching 80 to 100 or more pupils; pupil and teacher success judged through pre-set tests. There was some "slippage" even here, and some teachers resisted these constraints to some extent, though Beth did not.

The most pervasive and powerful factor in determining the level of institutional constraints in all the schools was technical control exerted through the timing of instruction, the curriculum and curriculum materials, the architecture of the school. Technical control reached through the walls into every teacher's classroom. It was most powerful for Beth, where the pace and form of instruction, the open architectural plan, the precise time scheduled, etc., all made deviation from the preferred pattern of teaching difficult. While present as a factor in all the other schools, technical control was less complete, was not reinforced by other forms of control (direct supervision or strong bureaucratic structures), and was more easily manipulated or ignored by the teachers.

(4) Possibly the most intriguing result of our study is the discovery that perspectives toward teaching were not situationally specific, as Becker and his colleagues (1961) discovered was the case with perspectives toward the practice of medicine among medical students. On the contrary, perspectives were generalized by three of

the teachers to situations which were very markedly different from those during student teaching in which the perspectives took shape. This generalized perspective persisted for two of the teachers even in the face of strong institutional pressures to change.

Notes

- ¹ See Berlak and Berlak (1981) for a discussion of the concept of dilemmas of teaching.
- ² Lacey (1977, pp. 67-68) defines a social strategy as the purposeful selection of ideas and actions by prospective teachers and the working out of their interrelationships in specific situations. He then identifies three distinct strategies that he claims are employed by prospective teachers in the face of institutional constraints. First, internalized adjustment refers to a response where individuals comply with the authority figure's definition of a situation and believe these constraints to be for the best. This strategy indicates those situations where an individual willingly develops into the kind of person the situation demands and socialization entails both behavioral conformity and value commitment.

On the other hand, strategic compliance refers to those instances where individuals comply with the constraints posed by a situation, but retain private reservations about doing so. This strategy implies that individuals do not act in ways consistent with their underlying beliefs, and conformity is essentially an adaptive response without the corresponding value basis on which the behavior presumably rests. Finally, the strategy of strategic redefinition refers to those situations where attempts to change are made by individuals who do not possess the formal power to do so. These individuals attempt to widen the range of acceptable behaviors in a situation and to introduce new and creative elements into a social setting.

³ Despite the lack of significant shifts in the substance of teacher perspectives during student teaching, there were several kinds of changes that did occur for most students. The shift to full-time status in a school which occurred with the onset of student teaching helped students gain more realistic perceptions of the work of teaching and of the teacher's role. Also, most students grew increasingly confident in their abilities to manage a classroom and to teach in their preferred styles and became less fearful of the potential threat posed by observations and evaluations of their teaching. See Tabachnick, Zeichner et al. (1982) for a more detailed discussion of these findings.

⁴ Two observers were present in each classroom for one or two days during each observation period.

⁵ One of these teachers was identified as "mentor," by the teacher being studied (i.e., someone looked to for suggestions and advice). The second teacher was identified by the principal as a teacher who knows the school well and is aware of its history and culture.

References

- Apple, M. Curricular form and the logic of technical control: The building of the possessive individual. In M. Apple & L. Weis (Eds.), Ideology and practice in education. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983.
- Becker, H., Geer, B., Hughes, E., & Strauss, A. Boys in white. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Berlak A., & Berlak, H. Dilemmas of schooling: Teaching and social change. London: Methuen, 1981.
- Carew, J., & Lightfoot, S. L. Beyond bias: Perspectives on classrooms. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- Dale, R. Implications of the rediscovery of the hidden curriculum for the sociology of teaching. In D. Gleason (Ed.), Identity and structure: Issues in the sociology of education. Driffield, England: Nafferton Books, 1977.
- Day, H. Attitude changes of beginning teachers after initial teaching experience. Journal of Teacher Education, 1959, 10, 326-328.
- Doyle, W. Classroom effects. Theory into practice, 1979, 18, 138-144.
- Dreeben, R. The nature of teaching: Schools and the work of teachers. Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman, 1970.
- Eddy, E. Becoming a teacher. New York: Teachers College Press, 1969.
- Edgar D., & Warren, R. Power and autonomy in teacher socialization. Sociology of Education, 1969, 42, 386-399.
- Edwards, R. Contested terrain; The transformation of the workplace in the 20th century. New York: Basic Books, 1979.
- Gaede O. Reality shock: A problem among first-year teachers. Clearinghouse, 1978, 51, 405-409.
- Gibson, R. The effects of school practice: The development of student perspectives. British Journal of Teacher Education, 1976, 2, 241-50.
- Gitlin, A. School structure and teachers' work. In M. Apple & L. Weis (Eds.), Ideology and practice in education. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983.
- Goodlad, J. Let's get on with the reconstruction. Kappan, 1982, 63, 19-20.

- Haller, E. Pupils' influences in teacher socialization: A socio-linguistic study. Sociology of Education, 1967, 40, 316-33.
- Hammersley, M. Teacher perspectives. Milton Keynes, England: The Open University Press, 1977.
- Hanson D., & Herrington, M. From college to classroom: The probationary year. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976.
- Hoy, W. The influence of experience on the beginning teacher. Journal of Educational Research, 1972, 66, 89-93.
- Hoy, W., & Rees, W. The bureaucratic socialization of student teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28, 23-26.
- Isaacson, N. A description of the nature and extent of support systems as perceived by beginning secondary teachers. Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1981.
- Janesick, V. An ethnographic study of a teacher's classroom perspective. East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on Teaching, Research Series No. 33, 1978.
- Johnston J., & Ryan, K. Research on the beginning teacher. In K. Howey & W. Gardner (Eds.), The education of teachers: A look ahead. New York: Longman, 1983.
- Kuhlman, E., & Hoy, W. The socialization of professionals into bureaucraties. Journal of Educational Administration, 1974, 12, 18-27.
- Lacey, C. The socialization of teachers. London: Methuen, 1977.
- Ligana, J. What happens to the attitudes of beginning teachers? Danville, Illinois: Institute Printers, 1970.
- Lortie, D. Teacher socialization: The Robinson Crusoe model. In The real world of the beginning teacher. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1966.
- Lortie, D. Observations on teaching as work. In R. Travers (Ed.), Second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.
- Lortie, D. Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Mardle G., & Walker, M. Strategies and structure: Critical notes on teacher socialization. In P. Woods (Ed.), Teacher strategies: Explorations in the sociology of the school. London: Croom Helm, 1980.
- McArthur, J. What does teaching do to teachers? Educational Administration Quarterly, 1978, 14, 89-103.

- Mead, G. H. The philosophy of the act. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.
- Metz, M. Classrooms and corridors. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1978.
- Newberry, J. The first year of experience: Influences on beginning teachers. A paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, New York, April, 1977. ERIC Document No. ED 137 299.
- Petty, M., & Hogben, D. Explorations of semantic space with beginning teachers: A study of socialization into teaching. British Journal of Teacher Education, 1980, 6, 51-61.
- Power, P. Aspects of the transition from education student to beginning teacher. Australian Journal of Education, 1981, 25, 288-96.
- Ryan, K. Don't smile until Christmas: Accounts of the first year of teaching. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Sharp, R., & Green, A. Education and social control. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.
- Spradbery, J. Conservative pupils? In G. Whitty & M. Young (Eds.), Explorations in the politics of school knowledge. Driffield, England: Nafferton Books, 1976.
- Stephens, J. The processes of schooling. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967.
- Tabachnick, B. R., Popkewitz, T., Zeichner, K. Teacher education and the professional perspectives of student teachers. Interchange, 1979-80, 10, 12-29.
- Tabachnick, B. R., Zeichner, K., Densmore, K., Adler, S., Egan, K. The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspectives. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, March, 1982.
- Tisher, R. Teacher induction: An international perspective on research and programs. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, March, 1982.
- Waller, W. The sociology of teaching. New York: Wiley, 1932.
- Weick, K. Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1976, 21, 1-19.

Wise, A. Legislated learning: The bureaucratization of the American classroom. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1979.

Wright, B., & Tuska, S. From dream to life in the psychology of becoming a teacher. School Review, 1968, 26, 183-93.

Zeichner, K. Myths and realities: Field-based experiences in preservice teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1980, 31, 45-55.

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. R. Are the effects of university teacher education washed out by school experience? Journal of Teacher Education, 1981, 32, 7-11.

APPENDIX A

Dilemmas of Teaching

Following are the definitions for each of the 17 dilemmas that were used to define teacher perspectives in this study. These dilemmas represent a refinement of our initial orienting framework and emerged from our study of 13 student teachers. If a dilemma was also utilized by Berlak and Berlak (1981) and/or by Hammersley (1977) this fact is noted in parenthesis at the end of the description of the dilemma.

Knowledge and Curriculum1. Public Knowledge--Personal Knowledge

On the one hand, an emphasis on public knowledge indicates a view that school knowledge consists primarily of accumulated bodies of information, skills, facts, etc. which exist external to and independent of the learner. On the other hand, an emphasis on personal knowledge indicates a view that the value of school knowledge is established primarily through its relationship to the learner. Implicit in this position is the view that school knowledge is useful and significant only insofar as it enables persons to make sense of their experience.

What is at issue here is the clarity of the distinction that the teacher makes between public knowledge on the one hand and pupils' everyday knowledge on the other. To what degree is students' personal knowledge ruled out as irrelevant in the teacher's definition of the school curriculum? To what degree does the teacher allow or even encourage children's interests, background experiences, etc. to contribute to the school curriculum? (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

2. Knowledge is Product--Knowledge is Process

An emphasis on knowledge as product indicates a view of school knowledge as organized bodies of information, facts, theories, etc., and the evaluation of pupil learning is seen as a question of conformity to or deviance from specifications laid down by the teacher (e.g., the "correct" answer). The process by which the answer is reached is regarded as relatively unproblematic. Here there is a concern for the reproduction of an answer by whatever means. On the other hand, a knowledge as process emphasis indicates a concern with the thinking and reasoning underlying the production of a product and this thinking process is viewed as a way of establishing the truth or validity of a body of content. The central issue here is whether mastery of content or substance takes priority over the mastery of skills of thinking and reasoning. (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

3. Knowledge is Certain--Knowledge is Problematic

An emphasis on knowledge as certain indicates an approach to school knowledge as truth "out there" to be uncritically accepted by children. On the other hand, where the emphasis is on knowledge as problematic, school knowledge is treated as constructed, tentative, and subject to social, political, and cultural influence. Here there is a concern with developing children's creative and critical abilities. (Berlak & Berlak)

4. Learning is Fragmented--Learning is Holistic

An emphasis on learning is fragmented indicates a view that learning is the accumulation of discrete parts or pieces; when one has mastered the pieces, one "knows" the whole. There is little concern that the parts be seen in relationship to the whole either before, during, or after the learning experience. From the learning is holistic perspective, the understanding of a whole is sought and is seen as a process that is something more than the learning of a series of parts. Learning is seen as the active construction of meaning by persons, and opportunities are provided for pupils to mentally act upon the material and to relate it to something already known. (Berlak & Berlak)

5. Learning is Unrelated--Learning is Integrated

This element is concerned with the degree to which teachers view school knowledge as compartmentalized within specific disciplines or content areas (unrelated) or the degree to which the boundaries between content areas are blurred (integrated). An integrated curricular emphasis would indicate that the teacher has made efforts to subordinate previously insulated subject areas to some relational idea or theme. (Hammersley)

6. Learning is Collective--Individual Activity

From the perspective of learning is an individual activity, learning proceeds best as an individual encounter between the child and material or between the child and teacher. Learning is seen as a function of each individual child's particular capabilities and/or motivation. On the other hand, an emphasis on learning as a collective activity indicates a view that learning proceeds best when ideas are exchanged in a cooperative and supportive setting where one person can test out his/her ideas against those of others. There is thought to be a construction of meaning by the community of learners that goes beyond what can be gained by individual encounters with materials and with teachers. (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

7. Teacher-Pupil Control over Pupil Learning: High--Low

The question here is the degree of control that the teacher versus pupils exert over such aspects of learning as when pupils are to begin an activity, how long they are to work at a particular

task, how pupils are to perform the tasks, and criteria by which student work is evaluated. (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

Teacher-Pupil Relationships

8. Distant--Personal Teacher-Pupil Relationships

A distant orientation to teacher-pupil relationships indicates a desire to maintain relatively detached and formal relationships with children, to maintain "a guarded professional face." On the other hand, a personal orientation to teacher-pupil relationships indicates a desire to establish close, informal, and honest relationships with children. Here the teacher is observed interacting with pupils about matters other than schoolwork, and "participates" with pupils rather than remaining detached. (Berlak & Berlak)

9. Teacher vs. Pupil Control over Pupil Behavior: High--Low

On the one hand, high control over pupil behavior indicates that the teacher makes many explicit rules for governing a wide range of pupil behavior. On the other hand, low control over pupil behavior indicates that children are asked to assume a great deal of responsibility for their behavior. There are not many explicit rules, and those that do exist are relatively ambiguous and/or narrow in scope. (Hammersley)

The Teacher's Role

10. The Teacher's Role: What to Teach. Bureaucratic--Functional--Independent

This element addresses the teacher's conception of his/her role regarding what to teach in relation to institutional requirements of schools and/or school districts. On the one hand, a bureaucratic response indicates that the teacher generally follows with little question the school curriculum that is prescribed by a school or school district. Here the teacher feels that it is inappropriate to alter that content which is prescribed from above, and the teacher recognizes the legitimate role of the institution to dictate practically all of the content of the school curriculum. On the other hand, a functional response indicates that there is evidence that the teacher adapts and interprets prescribed content for use in their particular situation. Finally, an independent response indicates that a teacher shows evidence of actively constructing curricular content independent of institutional directives. Here teachers may even ignore institutional directives and substitute content that they and/or the children have decided to address.

11. The Teacher's Role: How to Teach.
Bureaucratic--Functional--Independent

This element addresses the teacher's conception of his/her role regarding methods of instruction and is concerned with the degree of personal discretion utilized by teachers in determining the processes of their lessons. Bureaucratic, functional, and independent responses are defined as in the preceding dilemma.

12. The Teacher's Role: School Rules and Regulations.
Bureaucratic--Functional--Independent

This element addresses the teacher's conception of his/her role in relation to school rules and regulations. A bureaucratic, functional, and independent response are defined as above.

Student Diversity

13. Children as Unique--Children as Members of a Category

This dimension focuses on the degree to which teachers think about children as alike (a focus on shared characteristics) or in terms of a unique mix of many dimensions. How many and what kinds of categories does the teacher use to draw distinctions among children and how differentiated are the various categories? (Berlak & Berlak)

14. Universalism--Particularism: School Curriculum

A universalistic position would indicate a belief that all children should be exposed to the same curriculum either at the same time or at a different pace. On the other hand, a particularistic response indicates that a teacher feels and acts in a way that indicates a concern that there are some elements of the curriculum that should be offered only to certain individuals or groups of children. (Hammersley)

15. Universalism--Particularism: Student Behavior

A universalistic position indicates a situation where the same rules for behavior are applied to all students (e.g., uniform sanctions for the same transgressions). A particularistic position indicates a situation where rules for behavior are applied somewhat differentially. Here when the teacher applies rules for behavior he/she takes into account individual student characteristics such as age, ability, home background, etc. (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

16. Allocation of School/Teacher Resources: Equal--Differential

On the one hand, some teachers take the position that all students deserve an equal share (in terms of both quantity and quality) of school resources such as teacher time, materials, and

knowledge. On the other hand, some teacher's hold the view that some individual students or groups of students merit a greater share of resources than others. This element addresses the question of distributive justice in the classroom. (Berlak & Berlak)

17. Common Culture--Subgroup Consciousness

A common culture emphasis indicates a desire to develop in children a common set of values, norms, and social definitions. On the other hand, a subgroup consciousness emphasis indicates a desire to foster in children a greater awareness of themselves as a member of some subgroup distinguished from others by such factors as language, race, ethnicity, etc. (Berlak & Berlak)